

## MEMORIES OF LENIN

# MEMORIES OF LENIN

*By*

NADEZHDA K. KRUPSKAYA

*Translated by*

E. VERNEY

INDIA PUBLISHERS

UNIVERSITY ROAD - ALLAHABAD

PRINTED BY J. K. SHARMA AT THE ALLAHABAD LAW JOURNAL  
PRESS, ALLAHABAD

## TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

NADEZHDA KONSTANTINOVNA KRUPSKAYA—Lenin's wife and life-companion—author of these reminiscences, has this in common with Lenin: not only has she devoted her whole life to the struggle for the emancipation of the working class, but, as with him, this devotion has been marked by the utmost self-negation and modesty.

Thus, although these Memoirs must of necessity be to an extent autobiographical—in so far as N. K. Krupskaya was at Lenin's side from first to last in these years of struggle—yet, by dint of her extreme modesty, we learn little from them about her capabilities, her personality, and the leading positions which she has occupied in the Russian revolutionary movement.

One is therefore justified in prefacing these reminiscences with a brief outline of the career of their distinguished author.

Nadezhda Krupskaya came from the "intelligentsia." At the age of fourteen, after her father's death, she began earning her own living. While still at school she started giving lessons. N. Krupskaya took an active part in the work of the social-democratic circles, from the time of their inauguration in 1891. After the arrival of Lenin in St. Petersburg, their lives became closely interwoven. Together they helped to unite the isolated social-democratic circles of St. Petersburg into the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class. In exile in Siberia, N. K. Krupskaya not only helped Lenin in his literary work; she herself put in a tremendous amount of study and labour in initiating and leading the emancipation movement of Russian working-women. It was in exile that she wrote her important booklet *The Working Woman*. It was the first, and at that time the only, book written on that subject published by the Socialist movement.

In the period 1901-1903 N. Krupskaya filled the responsible post of Editorial Secretary of *Iskra*, and later was secretary of the Bolshevik fraction of the Social-Democratic Party. While in



charge of the correspondence and illegal communications with Russia during the period when the Bolsheviks were preparing for the 1905 Revolution, she became well known to all the leading comrades working "under-ground" in Russia. Her responsibilities included the tremendous work of ciphering and deciphering the correspondence. She returned to Russia with Lenin at the time of the 1905 Revolution, and went abroad with him again in 1907, where she remained until 1917.

From 1905 to 1908 N. Krupskaya was secretary of the Party Central Committee. In 1915-1916, in Switzerland, she wrote her book *Popular Education and Democracy*, in which, for the first time, the subject of the education of the people was placed on a firm Marxist basis.

On returning to Russia with Lenin in 1917, N. Krupskaya participated actively in the preparation for the October Revolution. In addition to working at the centre, she was active in the Viborg District of Petrograd, on the District Party Committee and the local Duma.

After the October Revolution, she was placed in one of the most important posts in the Education Department of the Soviet Government. All these positions N. Krupskaya has filled with unflagging courage and strength in face of all difficulties.

This translation is made from the second (revised and enlarged) Russian edition, published in Moscow this year.

SHOREHAM, SUSSEX,  
April, 1930.

ERIC VERNEY

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO SECOND RUSSIAN EDITION, MOSCOW, 1930

The reminiscences printed here have the object of presenting a picture of the conditions in which Vladimir Ilyich lived and worked.

The first series of reminiscences covers the period from 1894, from the time of my first acquaintanceship with Vladimir Ilyich up to 1908, the time of the second emigration. Here are included reminiscences of (1) work in Petersburg, (2) the time spent in exile, (3) the Munich and London periods of our first emigration, (4) the time preceding the Second Party Congress, the Second Congress itself, and the period directly following it up to 1905; then (5) come the reminiscences of 1905 abroad, (6) on 1905 in Petersburg, and, finally, (7) on the years 1906-7.

The majority of these reminiscences have already appeared in *Pravda*. Later, some of them were printed in a collection published by *Pravda*, and then in a symposium published by the State Publishing Co. (1926). Now the reminiscences have been enlarged and newly revised.

The second series of reminiscences will concern the second emigration (from 1908 to 1914), the epoch of the imperialist war and the period after the return from emigration in April 1917 until the moment of Vladimir Ilyich's death. Part of these reminiscences are already written.

In addition, the present series includes, in the form of an Appendix, a few articles written at various times, containing material characterising the different aspects of Lenin's life.

N. KRUPSKAYA



# CONTENTS

## PART I

CHAP.	PAGE
I. In Petersburg, 1893—1898	1
II. In Exile, 1898—1901	18
III. Munich, 1901—1902	37
IV. Life in London, 1902—1903	50
V. Geneva, 1903	66
VI. The Second Congress, July—August, 1903	68
VII. After the Second Congress, 1903—1904	76
VIII. Nineteen Five in Emigration.	88
IX. Nineteen Five in Petersburg	106
X. Petersburg And Finland, 1906—1907	115
XI. Again Abroad, End of 1907	130
Appendix :	134
1. Lenin's Method of Work	
2. Lenin on How to Write for the Masses	
3. Lenin and Chernyshevsky	
4. The Kind of Fiction that pleased Ilyich	
Notes	153

## PART II

CHAP.	PAGE
I. Introduction: The Three Periods of the Second Exile (1908-1917) ... ..	1
II. Years of Reaction ... .. Geneva, 1908	7
III. Paris, 1909-10 ... ..	26
IV. The Years of the Revolutionary Revival, 1911-1914 ... .. Paris, 1911-1912 Cracow, 1912-1914	46
V. The Years of the War to the February Revolution, 1914-1917 ... .. Cracow, 1914 Berne, 1914-1915 Zurich, 1916	99
VI. 1917: Before the October Revolution ...	145

## IN PETERSBURG, 1893-1898

Vladimir Ilyich arrived in St. Petersburg in the autumn of 1893. I did not get to know him at once, however. Some comrades told me that a certain learned Marxist had arrived from the Volga. Then they brought me an exercise-book containing a screed *On Markets*, which was being passed round for comrades to read in turn. The book contained the views both of our Petersburg Marxist (the technologist Herman Krassin) and of the new-comer from the Volga. The pages were folded in half. On the one side, in a straggling scrawl, with many crossings-out and insertions, were the opinions of H. Krassin. On the other side, carefully written, and without any alterations, were the notes and replies of our newly arrived friend.

At that time the problem of markets very much interested all us young Marxists. Among the Petersburg Marxist circles a special tendency was already beginning to be crystallised. To the representatives of this tendency the processes of social development appeared as something mechanical and schematic. Such an interpretation of social development completely neglected the rôle of the masses, the rôle of the proletariat. The revolutionary dialectic of Marxism was stowed away somewhere, and only lifeless "phases of development" remained. Nowadays of course any Marxist would be able to refute this mechanical viewpoint. At that time, however, our St. Petersburg Marxist circles were very much concerned about this issue. We were still very poorly equipped. Many of us knew nothing of Marx's works save the first volume of *Capital*, and had not even seen the text of the *Communist Manifesto*. It was thus more from instinct that we felt this mechanicalness to be quite the opposite of live Marxism.

The question of markets was closely connected with this general problem of the interpretation of Marxism. The advocates of mechanicalness generally approached the question very abstractly.

More than thirty years have passed since then and, unfortunately, the exercise-book I have referred to has not been preserved. I can therefore only speak of the impression it made upon us.

Our new Marxist friend treated this question of markets in a very concrete manner. It was linked up with the interests of the masses, and in the whole approach we sensed just that live Marxism that takes phenomena in their concrete surroundings and in their development.

One wanted to become more closely acquainted with this newcomer, to find out his views at closer range.

I did not actually see Vladimir Ilyich until Shrovetide, when it was decided to arrange for certain Petersburg comrades to confer with him. The conference was to take place at the home of the engineer Klasson,\* a prominent St. Petersburg Marxist, who had been with me in the same study-circle two years before. To screen our conference, we organised it as a pancake party.

At that meeting, besides Vladimir Ilyich, there were present: Klasson, Y. P. Korobko, Serebrovsky, S. I. Radchenko, and others. Potressov and Struve were to have come, but, I believe, did not turn up. I remember one moment particularly well. We were discussing the lines that we ought to follow. There did not seem to be general agreement. Someone was saying—I think it was Shevlyagin—that what was very important was to work in the Committee for illiteracy. Vladimir Ilyich laughed, and somehow his laughter sounded laconic. I never heard him laugh that way on any subsequent occasion.

"Well," he said, "if anyone wants to save the fatherland in the Committee for illiteracy, we won't hinder him!"

I ought to say that our generation of young people still witnessed the skirmishes of the *Narodniki*<sup>1</sup> with Tsardom. We saw how the Liberals at first were "sympathetic" about everything but after the breaking up of the "*Narodnaya Volya*"<sup>2</sup> Party, became cowed, feared every whisper, and started preaching "little things first."

One could quite understand Lenin's sarcastic remark. He

\*The meeting at R. Klasson's house took place during the Shrovetide of 1894. In the autumn of the same year, at Klasson's, Vladimir Ilyich read his article, "The Economic Content of Populism." The Lenin Institute was given this information by Klasson himself.

<sup>1</sup> For this and all numbered references in text, see Notes at end.

had come to discuss how we could take up the struggle together, and in response was treated to an appeal to distribute the pamphlets of the Committee for Illiteracy!

Later, when we had become closely acquainted, Vladimir Ilyich once told me about the attitude of the Liberals towards the arrest of his elder brother. All acquaintances shunned the Ulyanov family. Even an aged teacher, who had formerly come every evening to play chess, left off calling. There was no railway at Simbirsk at that time, and Vladimir Ilyich's mother had to go on horseback to Syzran in order to go on to St. Petersburg, where her eldest son was imprisoned. Vladimir Ilyich was sent to seek a companion for the journey. But no one out wanted to travel with the mother of an arrested man.

Vladimir Ilyich told me that this widespread cowardice made a very profound impression upon him at that time.

This youthful experience undoubtedly did leave its imprint on Lenin's attitude towards the Liberals. It was early that he learned the value of all Liberal chatter.

In the autumn of that same year, 1894, Vladimir Ilyich, in his article *The Economic Content of Populism, and its Criticism in Mr. Struve's Book*, wrote: "The bourgeoisie rules both in life in general and in Liberal society. It would seem therefore that it is necessary to turn away from this society and go to what is diametrically opposed to the bourgeoisie." (*Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 18, Russian Edition.)

And farther on:

"You (the Narodniki) attribute a desire to defend the bourgeoisie to anyone who demands that working-class ideologists break completely with these (Liberal) elements and serve exclusively those who are 'differentiated from the life' of bourgeois society." (*Ibid.*, p. 54.)

But Vladimir Ilyich's views on the Liberals, his mistrust of them, his continual exposure of them.....these are well known. I have merely given a few quotations relating to the same year that the meeting took place at Klasson's house.

At the "pancake party" no agreement was reached, of course. Vladimir Ilyich spoke little and was more occupied with contemplating those present. People who styled themselves Marxists became uncomfortable beneath his fixed glance.

I remember how, when we were returning home from the



Okhta along the banks of the Neva, I was first told about Vladimir Ilyich's brother, Alexander. He was a member of the Narodnaya Volya, and took part in the attempt on the life of Alexander III in 1886. He perished at the hands of the Tsar's hangmen before he had even come of age. (See Ref. Note No. 8). He was very fond of Alexander. They had many common tastes, and both of them liked to remain alone for long periods in order to concentrate. They usually lived together, at one time in a special part of the house. And when any of their numerous boy or girl cousins called, the brothers had a favourite phrase: "Oblige us with your absence." Both brothers were tenacious workers, and both were of revolutionary dispositions. But the difference in age probably made itself felt. For Alexander Ilyich did not tell Vladimir about everything.

Vladimir Ilyich told me of his brother's activity as a naturalist. The last summer that he came home, he had been preparing a dissertation on worms and was working all the time at the microscope. In order to get as much light as possible, he rose at daybreak and immediately set to work. "No, my brother won't make a revolutionary, I thought then," Vladimir Ilyich recounted; "a revolutionary cannot devote so much time to the study of worms." He soon saw how he was mistaken.

The fate of his brother undoubtedly profoundly influenced Vladimir Ilyich. What in addition played an important part was the fact that by this time Vladimir Ilyich had already begun to think independently on many subjects, and had already come to his own decision as to the necessity of revolutionary struggle.

Had it been otherwise, probably his brother's fate would only have caused him profound grief, or at the most awakened in him the resolve and aspiration to follow his brother's footsteps. In these circumstances his brother's fate whetted his brain, brought out in him an unusual sobriety of thought, the capacity to look truth straight in the face, not for one moment to be carried away by phrases or illusions. It developed in him an extremely honest approach to all problems.

In the autumn of 1894 Vladimir Ilyich read his work *The Friends of the People* to our circle. I remember how everybody scrambled for this book. It set out the aims of our struggle with remarkable clarity. *The Friends of the People*, in duplicated form, afterwards passed from hand to hand under the alias of the *Little*

*Yellow Books*. These were unsigned. They had a fairly wide circulation, and there can be no doubt but that they had a strong influence on the Marxist youth of those days. When in 1896 I was in Poltava, P. P. Romyantsev, who at that time was an active social-democrat and had just been released from prison, characterised *The Friends of the People* as the best, the strongest, and the most complete exposition of the standpoint of revolutionary social-democracy.

By the winter of 1894-1895, I had already got to know Vladimir Ilyich fairly intimately. He was occupied with the workers' study-circles beyond the Nevsky Gate. I had already been working for years in that district as a teacher in the Smolensky Sunday Evening Adult School, and was already fairly well-acquainted with local working-class life. Quite a number of the workmen in Vladimir Ilyich's circle were my pupils at the Sunday School: Babushkin, Borovkov, Gribakin, the Bodrovs—Arsenius and Phillip, Zhukov, and others. In those days the Sunday Evening Adult School was an excellent means for getting a thorough knowledge of the everyday life, the labour conditions, and the mood of the working masses. The Smolensky School had six hundred scholars, not counting the evening technical classes and the attached Women's and Obukhov Schools.

The workers displayed unlimited confidence in the "school-mistresses." Thus the gloomy watchman from the Gromov timberyards, with face beaming, told the teacher that he had been presented with a son; a consumptive textile-worker wanted her to teach her enterprising suitor to read and write; a Methodist workman who had spent his whole life seeking God wrote with satisfaction that only on Passion Sunday had he learned from Rudakov (another pupil) that there was no God at all. And how easy things had now become. For there was nothing worse than being a slave of God, as you couldn't do anything about it. But to be a human slave was much easier, as here a fight *was* possible. Then there was a tobacco-worker who used to drink every Sunday until he lost all human semblance. And he also seemed so saturated with the smell of tobacco, that one could not bend over his exercise-book without one's head beginning to swim. He wrote (using pot-hooks and hangers and leaving out the vowels) to the effect that he had found a three-year-old kiddy in the street, that she was living in their *artel*,<sup>3</sup> that they would have to hand her

over to the police, and it was a pity. Came a one-legged soldier and said—"Mikhail, whom you taught to read and write last year, died at work from exhaustion; while dying he remembered you, told me to give you his compliments and wished you a long life." A textile-worker who was a proud defender of the Tsar and priests uttered a warning: "beware of that dark chap there, as he's always prowling about on the *Gorokhovaya*."<sup>4</sup> Then an elderly worker argued that he could not possibly give up being a churchwarden "because it is sickening to see how the priests gull the people, and they must be led to see things clearly. But he is not at all attached to the church and understands quite well about the phases of development," and so on and so forth.

Workers belonging to our organisation went to the school in order to observe the people and note who could be brought into the circles or drawn into the movement. These workers did not regard all the women teachers in the same light. They distinguished to what extent the teachers were versed in the work of our circles. If they recognised a schoolmistress to be "one of us," they would make themselves known to her by some phrase or other. For instance, in discussing the question of the handicraft industry, they might say: "a handicraft-worker cannot compete against large-scale production." Or they would intervene with a leading question, such as: "What is the difference between the Petersburg worker and the Archangel *mujik*?" And after that they would give the teacher a meaning look, and nod to her in a particular way—as much as to say: "One of ours—we know."

They immediately related all that was doing on the highways and by-ways, for they knew that the teachers would hand on the information to the Organisation.

It was a kind of silent conspiracy. We were actually able to talk about anything in the school, although there was rarely a class without a spy; one had only to refrain from using the terrible words "tsar," "strike," etc., and the most fundamental problems could be referred to. But, officially, it was forbidden to discuss anything at all: on one occasion they closed down the so-called recapitulatory group, because an inspector who had put in an unexpected appearance discovered that the ten-times table was being taught there, whereas, according to the syllabus, only the four rules of arithmetic were allowed to be taught.

I lived at that time on the old Nevsky, in a house with a

through courtyard. On Sundays Vladimir Ilyich usually called to see me, on his way back from working with the circle. We used to start endless conversations. I was wedded to the school then, and would go without my food rather than miss a chance of talking about the pupils or about Semyannikov's, Thornton's, Maxwell's, and other factories around the Neva. Vladimir Ilyich was interested in the minutest detail describing the conditions and life of the workers. Taking the features separately he endeavoured to grasp the life of the worker as a whole—he tried to find what one could seize upon in order better to approach the worker with revolutionary propaganda. Most of the intellectuals of those days badly understood the workers. An intellectual would come to a circle and read the workers a kind of lecture. For a long time a manuscript translation of Engel's booklet, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, was passed round the circles. Vladimir Ilyich read with the workers from Marx's *Capital*, and explained it to them. The second half of the studies was devoted to the workers' questions about their work and labour conditions. He showed them how their life was linked up with the entire structure of society, and told them in what manner the existing order could be transformed. The combination of theory with practice was the particular feature of Vladimir Ilyich's work in the circles. Gradually other members of our circle also began to use this approach.

When the Vilna pamphlet *On Agitation* appeared the following year, the ground was already fully prepared for the conducting of agitation by leaflets. It was only necessary to start work. The method of agitation on the basis of the workers' everyday needs became rooted deeply in our Party work. I only fully understood how fruitful this method of work was some years later when, living as an *émigrée* in France, I observed how, during the tremendous postal strike in Paris, the French Socialist Party stood completely aside and did not intervene in the strike. It was the business of the Trade Unions, they said. They thought the work of the Party was simply the political struggle. They had not the remotest notion as to the necessity for connecting up the economic and political struggles.

Many of the comrades working then in Petersburg, seeing the effect of agitation by printed matter, were allured with this form of work, and forgot that it is one of the forms, but not the sole form,

of work among the masses. It was they who took the path of "Economism." (See Reference Note No. 14.)

Vladimir Ilyich never forgot the other forms of work. In 1895 he wrote the pamphlet *The Law on Fines*. In this pamphlet he gave a brilliant example of how to approach the middle-grade workers of that time, and, on the basis of their needs, lead them step by step to the question of the necessity for political struggle. Many intellectuals thought this pamphlet long and dry, but the workers read it willingly, for it was clear to them and near to them. (It was printed at the Narodnaya Volya press, and distributed among the workers.) Vladimir Ilyich used to study the factory laws carefully. He reckoned that by explaining these laws it was particularly easy to enlighten the workers as to the connection between their position and the State. Traces of this study are visible in quite a number of articles and pamphlets written at that period for the workers, in the pamphlet *The New Factory Act*, and in *On Strikes*, *On Industrial Courts*, and other articles.

Going the round of the workers' circles, however, could not be done with impunity: police surveillance began to increase. Of all our group Vladimir Ilyich was the best equipped for conspiratorial work. He knew all the through courtyards, and was a skilled hand at giving police-spies the slip. He taught us how to write in books with invisible ink, or by the dot method; how to mark secret signs, and thought out all manner of aliases. In general, one felt the benefit of his good apprenticeship in the ways of the Narodnaya Volya Party. It was not for nothing that he spoke with such esteem of the old nihilist Mikhailov, who had earned the nickname "Dvornik" ("the watchman") by dint of his prowess at conspiracy.

The surveillance kept increasing, and Vladimir Ilyich insisted that a "successor" should be appointed who was not being watched and to whom he could transfer all the contacts. As I was the "cleanest" of them all [i.e., least known to the police as an active revolutionist—Trans.], it was decided to appoint me as the "inheritrix." On the first day of Easter five or six of us went to "celebrate the festival" at Tsarskoye Selo with one of the members of our group—Silvin, who earned his living there at odd jobs. We travelled by train, pretending not to know one another. We sat nearly the whole day discussing which contacts should be preserved. Vladimir Ilyich showed us how to use cipher, and we used

up nearly half a book. Alas, I was afterwards unable to decode this first collective ciphering! One consolation, however, was that, by the time these records were required to be deciphered, the majority of the "contacts" were no longer usable.

Vladimir Ilyich carefully collected such "contacts," and sought everywhere for people who, in one way or another, could be useful for revolutionary work. I remember how a conference was once arranged, on Vladimir Ilyich's initiative, between the representatives of our group (Vladimir Ilyich and, I believe, Krzhizhnikovsky) and a group of women Sunday-school teachers. Nearly all of them became Social Democrats afterwards. Among them was Lydia Mikhailovna Knippovich, an old member of the Narodnaya Volya, who after a certain time came over to the Social Democrats. Old Party workers still remember her. She had tremendous revolutionary firmness of character, was strict with herself and others. At the same time she had the knack of understanding people, was a fine comrade and showed her affection and concern for those with whom she worked. Lydia immediately appreciated the revolutionary in Vladimir Ilyich.

Lydia Mikhailovna volunteered to maintain liaison with the Narodnaya Volya printing press. She used to make all the arrangements for the printing, hand on the manuscripts, and receive from the press the printed pamphlets. She carried these round in baskets to her friends and organised literature distribution to the workers. When she was arrested—on the information of a compositor at the press who turned traitor—twelve baskets full of illegal pamphlets were confiscated from various friends of Lydia's. The Narodnaya Volya press at that time printed masses of pamphlets for workers: *The Working Day*, *What Different People Live On*, Lenin's pamphlet *On Fines, King-Hunger*, and others. Two of the workers at that press—Shapovalov and Katanskaya—are now in the ranks of the Communist Party. Lydia Mikhailovna is no longer among the living. She died in 1920, when the Crimea, where she lived in latter years, was under the Whites. On her death-bed, in a last delirium, she craved for her own folk, for the Communists, and died with the name of the Communist Party, so dear to her, on her lips.

From among those school-mistresses, I believe, were also P. F. Kudeli, A. I. Meshcheryakov (both now Party members) and others. Another teacher in the Nevsky Gate district was

Alexandra Mikhailovna Kalmykova. She was a fine lecturer; I remember her lecture for workers on the State Budget. She then owned a bookshop on the Liteyny. Vladimir Ilyich became very closely acquainted with Alexandra Mikhailovna. One of her pupils was Struve, and Potressov, an old school-mate of Struve's, was always at her place. Later, Alexandra Mikhailovna subsidised with her own money the old *Iskra*, right up to the time of the Second Congress. She did not follow in the wake of Struve when he went over to the Liberals, but definitely associated herself with the *Iskra* organisation. Her alias was "Auntie." She got on very well with Vladimir Ilyich. Now she is dead, after having been bed-ridden for two years at a sanatorium at Detskoye Selo. She used to be visited sometimes by youngsters from the neighbouring Children's Homes. She told them all about Ilyich.

Alexandra Mikhailovna wrote to me in the spring of 1924 that we ought to publish as a separate booklet Lenin's 1917 articles, filled as they were with his burning passion and his ardent appeals that had such effect on the masses. In 1922 Vladimir Ilyich had written Alexandra Mikhailovna a few lines of fervent greeting, such as only he could write.

Alexandra Mikhailovna had been closely connected with the "Emancipation of Labour"<sup>6</sup> group. On one occasion (I believe in 1899), when Zassulich came to Russia, Alexandra Mikhailovna arranged for her illegal sojourn, and continually maintained contact with her. Under the influence of the workers' movement then beginning to grow, of the articles and books of the "Emancipation of Labour" group, and of the Petersburg Social Democrats, Potressov went "Left," as also did Struve for a time. After a number of preliminary meetings the ground began to be sounded for joint work. It was proposed to publish jointly a symposium: *Materials Characterising our Economic Development*. Our group was represented on the Editorial Board by Vladimir Ilyich, Starkov, and Stepan Ivanovich Radchenko; theirs by Struve, Potressov and Klasson. The fate of that symposium is well known. It was burned by the Tsarist censor. In the spring of 1895, before going abroad, Vladimir Ilyich went more and more often to Ozerny Street, where Potressov lived, hastening to finish the work.

Vladimir Ilyich spent the summer of 1895 abroad, living part of the time in Berlin, where he attended workers' meetings, and

partly in Switzerland, where he first saw Plekhanov, Axelrod and Zassulich. He came back full of impressions and brought from abroad a trunk with a double lining, the space between this and the trunk walls being crammed full of illegal literature.

No sooner had he returned when the police were hot on his trail. They followed him and they followed his trunk. At that time I had a cousin working at an address bureau. A couple of days after Vladimir Ilyich arrived she told me that the night she was on duty a detective came and turned over the index of addresses (the addresses at the bureau were classified in alphabetical order). He said boastfully: "Look, we've tracked down the important State criminal, Ulyanov—his brother was hanged—he's just come from abroad, but he won't escape us now." Knowing that I knew Vladimir Ilyich, my cousin made haste to inform me of this. I of course immediately warned him. The most extreme caution was necessary. But the work could not wait, and we got still busier. We divided the work up, according to districts. We began to draw up and distribute leaflets. I remember that Vladimir Ilyich drew up the first leaflet for the workers of the Semyannikov works.\* We had no technical facilities at all then. The leaflet was copied out by hand in printed letters and distributed by Babushkin. Out of the four copies two were picked up by the watchman, while two went round from hand to hand. Leaflets were also distributed in other districts. On Vassilievsky Ostrov, for example, a leaflet was got out for the women workers of the Laferme tobacco factory. A. A. Yakubova and Z. P. Nevzorova (Krzhizhanovskaya) had recourse to the following method of distribution: they rolled up the leaflets into little tubes so that they could easily be taken one by one and arranged them in their aprons in a suitable manner. Then, immediately the hooter sounded, they walked briskly towards the women who were pouring out in throngs from the factory gates and, passing by almost at a trot, scattered the leaflets right into the hands of the perplexed workers.

It was further decided to publish—and for this we had to thank an illegal printing press—a popular journal, *The Workers' Cause*. Vladimir Ilyich assiduously prepared the material for this.

\*The leaflet to the workers of the Semyannikov works relates to the beginning of 1895. The actual leaflet has not been found. (See *Lenin's Works*, Vol. I, p. 462, Russian edn.).



Every line passed through his hands. I remember a meeting in my rooms when Zaporozhietz was telling us with great enthusiasm about the material he had succeeded in collecting at the boot factory near the Moscow Gate. "We are fined for everything," he said. "Shove a heel on a bit to one side and bang goes another fine!" Vladimir Ilyich said, laughingly: "Well, if you put a heel on all askew, you deserved to be fined." Vladimir Ilyich very carefully collected and verified this material. I remember, for example, how the material about the Thornton factory was collected. It was decided that I should send for a pupil of mine named Krolikov, a sorter in that factory, who had previously been deported from Petersburg. I was to collect from him all information, according to a plan drawn up by Vladimir Ilyich. Krolikov arrived in a fine fur coat he had borrowed from someone, and brought a whole exercise-book full of information, which he further supplemented verbally. This data was very valuable. In fact Vladimir Ilyich fairly pounced on it. Afterwards I and Apollinaria Alexandrovna Yakubova put kerchiefs on our heads and made ourselves look like women factory-workers, and went personally to the Thornton factory-barracks, visiting both the single and the married quarters. Conditions were most appalling. It was solely on the basis of material gathered in this manner that Vladimir Ilyich wrote his letters and leaflets. Examine his leaflets addressed to the working men and women of the Thornton factory. The detailed knowledge of the subject they deal with is at once apparent. And what a schooling this was for all the comrades working then! It was just then that we were learning attention to details. And how profoundly these details were engraved in our minds.

Our paper, *The Workers' Cause*, never saw the light. On December 8th a meeting was held in my rooms, at which the first number was finally revised for the press. There were two copies of the proofs. One was taken by Vaneyev for final examination, and the other remained with me. Next morning I went to Vaneyev for the corrected copy, but the maid told me that he had left the house. It had been previously arranged with Vladimir Ilyich that in case anything went wrong I should seek information about him from his friend Cherbotariiev, who was also a colleague of mine at the head offices of the railway where I was then employed. Vladimir Ilyich used to dine at Cherbotariiev's and went there every day. But Cherbotariiev did not turn up at the office. I went to his

house. Vladimir Ilyich had not been in to dinner. It was clear that he was arrested. By the evening it was ascertained that many members of our group had been arrested. I took the copy of *The Workers' Cause* that had remained with me to Nina Alexandrovna Gerd for safekeeping. She was an old school-friend and the future wife of Struve. In order to avoid any more of us being arrested, it was decided not to print *The Workers' Cause* for the time being.

This Petersburg period of Vladimir Ilyich's work was one of extreme importance, although the work was unobserved and not apparent in substance. He himself so described it. There were no external effects. We were not concerned with heroic moves, but with how to establish close contact with the masses, to become intimate with them, to learn to be the expression of their best aspirations, to learn how to make them understand us and follow our lead. But it was precisely during this period of work in St. Petersburg that Vladimir Ilyich became moulded as leader of the working masses.

When I went to the school for the first time after the arrest of our people, Babushkin called me into a corner beneath the staircase and handed me a leaflet written by the workers about the arrests. The leaflet was of a purely political nature. Babushkin asked me to get it reproduced, and to let them have the copies back for distribution. Up till that time I had never let him know directly that I was connected with the organisation. But I handed the leaflet on to our group. I remember that meeting—it was in S. I. Radchenko's apartment. All the remnants of the group were gathered there. Lyakhovsky read the leaflet, and exclaimed: "Do you think we can print this leaflet? Why, it is on a purely political theme." However, as the leaflet had undoubtedly been written by the workers on their own initiative, and as they had asked us to print it without fail, it was decided to do it.

Contact with Vladimir Ilyich was very quickly established. In those days prisoners under preliminary detention were allowed to have as many books sent them as they liked. These were subjected to a rather superficial examination, during which it was not possible to notice the minute dots placed inside various letters, or the hardly discernible change in the colour of the paper where inscriptions had been penned with milk. We rapidly perfected our technique at secret correspondence. Characteristic of Vladimir Ilyich was his concern for the other comrades in prison. Every

letter he wrote to the outside world contained various commissions to be carried out on behalf of the prisoners. Thus, so-and-so has no visitors—you must find him a “sweet-heart;” or tell such-and-such a fellow-prisoner, through his relatives when they next visit him, to look for a letter in such-and-such a book in the prison library; or bring so-and-so warm boots.....He corresponded with a great many of the comrades in prison, for whom his letters were of tremendous significance. Letters from Vladimir Ilyich vibrated with courageous spirit, and spoke mainly of our work. Those who received them forgot they were in prison, and themselves settled down to work. I remember the impression from those letters (in August 1896 I also was in jail). Letters written in milk came through from outside on the day for sending books—Saturday. One would immediately look at the secret signs in the book and ascertain whether a letter was inside. At six o'clock they brought hot water for tea and the wardress led the criminals out to the church. By this time the “politicals” would have the letters torn into long strips. Then they would make their tea, and as soon as the wardress departed begin to drop the strips into the hot tea. Thus the letters would be “developed.” (In prison it was not advisable to treat these letters by candle-flame, and it was Vladimir Ilyich who thought out the idea of developing them in hot water.) And what courage these letters breathed, how absorbingly interesting they were to read! Just as Vladimir Ilyich was the pivot of all our work outside, so in prison he was the centre of contact with the outside world.

But apart from this, he did a great deal of work in prison. He prepared *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. In his legal letters Vladimir Ilyich ordered necessary material and statistical works. “It is a pity they let us out so soon,” he said jokingly. “I would have liked to do a little more work on the book. It will be difficult to obtain books in Siberia.” Vladimir Ilyich wrote not only *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* in prison. He wrote leaflets, illegal pamphlets, and the draft programme for the First Congress (which did not take place until 1898, although it was to have been held earlier). He also gave his opinion on questions discussed in the organisation. In order not to be discovered while writing with milk, he made little milk-“inkpots” out of bread. These he popped into his mouth immediately he heard a rattle

at the grating. "Today I have eaten six inkpots," ran the postscript to one of his letters.

But no matter how much he mastered himself, no matter how much he set for himself a definite regime, even Vladimir Ilyich was affected by prison melancholy. In one of his letters he put forward this plan: When they were taken out for exercise, it was possible through one of the windows in the corridor to catch a momentary glimpse of a fragment of the Shpalernaya pavement. So he suggested that at a definite time I and Apollinaria Alexandrovna Yakubova should come and stand on this piece of pavement, and then he would see us. Apollinaria for some reason or other was unable to go. I went several days and stood a long while on that spot. Something went wrong with the plan, however, though I do not remember what.

While Vladimir Ilyich was in prison, the work outside still extended and the workers' movement grew. After the arrest of Martov, Lyakhovsky and others, the forces of our group were further diminished. It is true new comrades joined the group, but these were people with less theoretical training. There was no time for study, for the movement demanded active service and a tremendous amount of energy. Everything went in agitation. There was not time even to think of propaganda. Our printed agitation was very successful. The leaflets were often drawn up hurriedly without an adequate study of concrete conditions. The weavers' strike of 1896 took place under social-democratic influence. This turned the heads of many comrades. The basis arose for the growth of "Economism." I remember how once (I think at the beginning of August), at a meeting in the woods, Silvin read out aloud the draft for a leaflet. In one place a sentence had crept in which absolutely limited the workers' movement to the economic struggle alone. After reading this sentence out aloud, Silvin stopped short and said laughingly: "Why, I've tripped up myself. What could have prompted me to do it!" The offending sentence was deleted from the draft. In the summer of 1896 the Lakhtinsky printing press collapsed, and we were no longer able to print pamphlets. Our arrangements for the journal had to be postponed indefinitely.

During the 1896 strike we were joined by the Takhtariiev group, who were known by the pseudonym "The Monkeys," and also

Chernyshev's group, known as "The Cocks."\* But while the *Dekabrists*<sup>6</sup> were in prison, and maintained contact with outside, the work still followed the old course. When Vladimir Ilyich was released,† I was still inside. In spite of the commotion which surrounded anyone coming out of prison, Vladimir Ilyich, at a number of meetings, contrived nevertheless to write me a little note about what went on. My mother told me he had even got fatter in prison, and was a terrible weight.

I was released soon after the "Vetrova affair" (a woman prisoner named Vetrova had burned herself alive in the fortress). The gendarmes then released a whole number of women prisoners, letting them remain in Petersburg until their case was completed, but putting on a couple of detectives to follow their every step. I found the organisation in a most lamentable state. Out of the former active members there remained only Stepan I. Radchenko and his wife. He was not able himself to carry on the work under conditions of secrecy, but continued to act as centre and maintained contact.

Contact was also kept up with Struve. He married Nina Alexandrovna Gerd shortly afterwards. She was a Social Democrat, and at that time he was himself more or less a Social Democrat. He was quite incapable of working in the organisation, and still more so of illegal work, but it undoubtedly flattered him to be applied to for advice. He even wrote a manifesto for the first Congress of the Social-Democratic Labour Party. In the winter of 1897-1898 I called fairly often on Struve with commissions from Vladimir Ilyich. Struve was then editor of the *Novoye Slovo* (New Word). Many things also brought me in contact with Nina Alexandrovna. I used to observe Struve. He was a sincere Social Democrat at that time. Yet I was astonished to see how bookish he was, and to note his complete lack of interest in the "living tree of life," in which Vladimir Ilyich's interest was so keen. Struve obtained translations for me and undertook to edit them. He was visibly wearied by this work and quickly tired. (With Vladimir Ilyich we would sit for hours at the same occupation. But he worked quite differently, putting his whole weight into even such a job as translation.) For recreation Struve took to reading Fet. Someone has written in his memoirs that Vladimir Ilyich liked Fet. That

\*On August 12th another crash came: nearly all the "old men" were caught, and the best elements of the "cocks."

†Vladimir Ilyich was released from prison on February 26th, 1897.

is not so. Fet was an out-and-out feudalist and not worth while even dipping into. But Struve really did like Fet. In those days Struve was unquestionably on good terms with Vladimir Ilyich.

I also knew Tugan-Baranovsky. I was at school with his wife, Lydia Karlovna Davydova (daughter of the woman publisher of *God's World*), and used to visit them. Lydia was a very good and clever woman, although weak-willed. She was more intelligent than her husband. In his conversations one always felt he was not one of us. Once I went to him with a collecting sheet for a strike (I think it was at Kostroma). I received something—I forget how much, but had to hear a dissertation on the theme: "I cannot understand why we must support strikes. A strike is not a sufficiently effective means of combating the owners." I took the money and made haste to leave.

I wrote to Vladimir Ilyich about everything I managed to see and hear. But there was little to write about concerning the organization. By the time of the Congress, only four of us were left in the group: S. I. Radchenko, his wife, Liubov Nikolaevna Sammer, and I. Our delegate was Stepan Ivanovich (Radchenko). But on returning from the Congress he told us practically nothing about what happened there. He extracted from the back of a book the "manifesto" written by Struve and adopted by the Congress, with which we were all well acquainted, and started grumbling: nearly all the delegates to the Congress—there were several—had been arrested.

I was given three years' exile in the Ufa Gubernia. I made a request to be transferred to the village of Shushenskoye, in the Minussinsk region, where Vladimir Ilyich was living. For this purpose I described myself as his "fiancée."

I went to Minussinsk at my own expense, accompanied by my mother. We arrived at Krasnoyarsk on May 1st, 1898, whence we had to go by steamer up the Yenissei. The steamer service, however, had not yet recommenced. At Krasnoyarsk we met the "*narodopravets*"<sup>7</sup> Tiutchiev and his wife, who, being experienced people in these things, arranged for me an interview with a party of Social Democrats who were passing through Krasnoyarsk. Among them were comrades who had been charged with me in the same case—Lengnik and Silvin. The soldiers, who were taking the exiles to be photographed, sat to one side and munched the bread and sausage we had proffered them.

At Minussinsk I went to see Arkady Tyrkov, one of the "First of March"<sup>8</sup> exiles, to convey greetings from his sister, who was an old school-chum of mine. I also visited Felix Y. Kon, who, to me, was surrounded with the halo of an old intransigent revolutionary. I liked him tremendously.

It was dusk when we arrived at Shushenskoye, where Vladimir Ilyich lived; Vladimir Ilyich was out hunting. We unloaded and were led into the *izba* (log-hut). In the Minussinsk regions of Siberia the peasants are particularly clean in their habits. The floors are covered with brightly coloured home-spun mats, the walls whitewashed and decorated with fir-branches. The room used by Vladimir Ilyich, though not large, was spotlessly clean. My mother and I were given the remaining part of the cottage. The owners of the *izba* and their neighbours all crowded in, eagerly looking us up and down and questioning us. At last Vladimir Ilyich returned from the hunt. He was surprised to see a light in his room. The master of the house told him that it was Oscar Alexandrovich (an exiled Petersburg worker) who had come home drunk and scattered all his books about. Vladimir Ilyich quickly bounded up the steps. At that moment I emerged from the *izba*. We talked for hours and hours that night. Ilyich looked much fitter and fairly vibrated with health.

At Shushenskoye there were only two workmen exiles. One was Prominsky, a Polish hat-maker from Lodz, a Social Democrat, with a wife and six children. The other was Enberg, from the Patulov Works, Petersburg, a Finn by nationality. Both were very fine comrades. Prominsky was a quiet, even-minded, but very hard man. He read little and did not know very much, but had a remarkably clearly expressed class instinct. His attitude towards his then still religious wife was of a gently-mocking nature. He was exceedingly fond of hunting. On Sundays he put on his holiday attire and a particularly beaming smile seemed to adorn his face. He was a very fine singer of Polish revolutionary songs—"Ludu Roboczy," "Pierwszy Maj,"\* and many others. The children sang with him and Vladimir Ilyich also joined in the choruses. He sang a great deal and with great gusto in Siberia. Prominsky also sang Russian revolutionary songs which Lenin had taught him. Prominsky intended going back to Poland to work, and killed incalculable numbers of hares to make fur-coats for the children. But he never succeeded in getting back to Poland. He and his family did not get farther than the vicinity of Krasnoyarsk, where he obtained a job on the railway. The children are now grown up. Prominsky himself became a Communist, his wife Panya Prominskaya also turned Communist, and the children have become Communist, too. One was killed in the war. Another only just escaped death in the civil war and is now at Chita. Only in 1923 did Prominsky leave for Poland, but died on the way from typhus.

The other worker was quite a different type. He was young and had been exiled for taking part in a strike, and for riotous conduct during its progress. He read a great deal on all possible subjects, yet had a most hazy notion of what was Socialism. Once he came home from the Volost and said, "A new clerk has arrived, and we agree in our convictions."—"Which means?" I asked.—"Both he and I," he replied, "are against revolution." Vladimir Ilyich and I burst out laughing. Next day I sat down with him to study the *Communist Manifesto* (which I had to translate from the German). After we had surmounted that we went on to read *Capital*. At one of the lessons Prominsky came in and sat down, puffing away at his pipe. I asked some question about what we had read. Oscar

\*"Working People," "First of May."



did not know what to reply, but Prominsky, in his quiet way, smiling to himself, answered the question. Oscar gave up studying for a whole week after that. He was a fine fellow, all the same. There were no other exiles at Shushenskoye. Vladimir Ilyich told me he had tried to become acquainted with the local teacher, but without result. The teacher was inclined towards the local aristocracy: the priest and a couple of shopkeepers, with whom he passed the time playing cards and drinking. He had not the slightest interest in social problems. Prominsky's eldest son Leopold, who already then was sympathetic to the Socialists, was constantly at loggerheads with this teacher.

Vladimir Ilyich had a peasant friend, Zhuravliev, of whom he was very fond. A consumptive, thirty years of age, Zhuravliev had formerly been a rural clerk. Vladimir Ilyich said of him that he was by nature a revolutionary, a protester. Zhuravliev courageously opposed the rich and would not countenance the slightest injustice. He went away somewhere, and before long died from consumption.

Another acquaintance of Ilyich's was a poor peasant with whom he frequently went hunting. He was a most thick-headed old *muji*, and they called him Sosipatysh. But he was on excellent terms with Vladimir Ilyich, and used to make him presents of all manner of strange things: one time it would be a crane, another time cedar cones.

It was through Sosipatysh and through Zhuravliev that Vladimir Ilyich studied the Siberian countryside. He told me once about a conversation of his with the wealthy peasant with whom he was lodging. A farm-labourer had stolen a skin from the latter. The rich peasant caught him red-handed, and finished him off there and then. Apropos of this, Ilyich spoke of the ruthless cruelty of the petty-proprietor, the ruthless way he exploited the farm-labourers. And truly, the Siberian farm-hands worked as if in servitude, only snatching a little rest at holiday time.

Ilyich had yet another method of studying the countryside. On Sundays he ran a juridical consultation. He enjoyed great popularity as a jurist, as he had helped one worker, who had been turned off the gold-mines, to win his case against the goldfield proprietor. News about the winning of this case quickly spread among the peasants. *Mujiks* and peasant women came and unburdened their woes. Vladimir Ilyich listened attentively and prob-

ed into everything, afterwards giving his advice. Once a peasant came twenty *vershs* for advice as to how he could get judgment against his brother-in-law for not having invited him to his wedding, where there had been a fine drinking-bout. "But if I go to see him now, will my brother-in-law offer any drinks?" "Of course he will, if you go now." And it took Vladimir Ilyich the best part of an hour before he could persuade the *muji* to make peace with his brother-in-law. Sometimes it was quite impossible to make head or tail of the case from the stories they narrated, and therefore Vladimir Ilyich always asked them to bring him a copy of the relevant documents. Once a bull owned by some wealthy farmer gored a cow belonging to a poor peasant woman. The Volost court ordered the proprietor to pay the woman ten roubles. She contested this decision and demanded a "copy" of the case. "What d'you want, a copy of the white cow, eh?" mockingly asked the assessor. The enraged peasant brought her complaint to Vladimir Ilyich. It was often sufficient for the offended person to threaten to complain to Ulyanov and the offender would desist. Vladimir Ilyich studied the Siberian village very closely—just as he had formerly acquired a thorough knowledge of the Volga countryside. Ilyich told me once: "My mother wanted me to take up farming. I was going to start when I saw that it was not possible. My relations with the *muji*s would have become abnormal."

Strictly speaking, Vladimir Ilyich, as an exile, had not the right to occupy himself with juridical affairs. But these were liberal times in the Minussinsk region, and there was practically no surveillance.

The "assessor"—a wealthy local peasant—was more concerned with selling us his veal than in seeing that "his" exiles did not escape. Things were astonishingly cheap at Shushenskoye. For example, Vladimir Ilyich, on his "salary"—a subvention of eight roubles—had a clean room, food, and his laundry and mending done. And this was considered dear! It is true, dinner and supper were rather plain. One week they would kill a sheep and feed Vladimir Ilyich with it from day to day until it was all eaten up. When it was all gone they would buy the meat for another week, and the farm-girl chopped up this supply in the trough where the cattle fodder was prepared. This mincemeat was used for cutlets for Vladimir Ilyich—also for a whole week. But there was plenty of milk for both Vladimir Ilyich and his dog—a fine Gordon

setter named Zhenka, whom he taught to fetch and carry, to retrieve and to perform other canine manœuvres.

As the Zyryanovs often held peasant drinking-bouts at their place, and as family life was uncomfortable there in many respects, we soon moved to other quarters. We hired half a house with yard and kitchen-garden attached, for four roubles. We lived as one family. In the summer it was impossible to find anyone to help with the housework. I and another together fought with the Russian stove. At first I knocked over with the oven-hook the soup and dumplings, which were scattered over the hearth. But afterwards I got used to it. All sorts of things grew in our kitchen-garden—cucumbers, carrots, beetroots, pumpkins; I was very proud of our kitchen-garden. We also turned the yard into a garden, getting hops from the woods to plant in it.

In October a girl-help appeared on the scene. This was thirteen-year-old Pasha, scraggy, with pointed elbows. She soon picked up the whole gamut of household duties. I taught her to read and write, and she adorned the walls with my mother's instructions: "never, never, spill the tea." She also kept a diary, where such entries were inscribed as: "Oscar Alexandrovich and Prominsky called. They sang a 'sing.' I also sang."

Then the infantile element put in an appearance. Across the way lived a settler, a Lettish felt-boot-maker. He had had fourteen children, but only one was still living. This was Minka. Minka was six years old, and had a transparent, pale little face. His father was a confirmed drunkard. Minka had clear eyes and a serious way of talking. He began to come every day. We would only just be up when the door would bang, and a little figure appear, clad in a big fur cap and warm jacket wound round in a scarf, joyfully exclaiming: "And here I am!" He knew that my mother was infatuated with him, and that Vladimir Ilyich was always willing for a joke or a game. Minka's mother would run across, shouting:

"Minichka, have you seen a rouble?"

"Yes, but I saw that it was lying about on the table, so I put it in the box."

When we went away Minka fell ill with grief. Now he is no longer living, and the bootmaker has written asking for a piece of land over by the Yenissei—"for I don't want to go hungry in my old age."

Our household grew still larger. We were joined by a kitten.

In the mornings Vladimir Ilyich and I set to and translated the Webbs, which Struve had obtained for us. After dinner we spent an hour or two jointly rewriting *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. Then there was other work of all kinds. I think it was Potressov sent us for two weeks only Kautsky's book against Bernstein. We put aside all other jobs and translated it in the appointed period—just two weeks. The work ended, we went walking. Vladimir Ilyich was passionately fond of hunting. He procured himself some leather breeches, and got into any number of bogs. "Well, there was game there," was his excuse. When I arrived it was spring and I had been perplexed. Prominsky would come in, and with a joyful smile, exclaim: "I've seen them—the ducks have flown over." Then Oscar would enter—also full of ducks. They talked for hours on the subject, but by the following spring I had also become capable of conversing about ducks—who had seen them, and where, and when. After the winter frosts, Nature burst forth tempestuously into the spring. Her power became mighty. Sunset. In the great spring-time pools in the fields wild swans were swimming. Or we stood at the edge of a wood and listened to a rivulet bubbling, or wood-cocks clucking. Vladimir Ilyich went into the wood while I held back Zhenka. As I held her the dog trembled with excitement and one felt how overwhelming was this tumultuous awakening of nature. Vladimir Ilyich was an ardent huntsman, but too apt to become heated over it. In the autumn we went to far-off forest clearances. Vladimir Ilyich said: "If we meet any hares, I won't fire as I didn't bring any straps, and it won't be convenient to carry them." Yet immediately a hare darted out Vladimir Ilyich fired.

Late in the autumn, when small ice was already drifting down the Yenissei, we went after hares on the islands. The hares were already turning white. They could not get away from the islands, and were jumping around like goats. Our hunters would sometimes shoot whole boat-loads.

When we lived in Moscow, Vladimir Ilyich also hunted at times in latter years, but by that time the huntsman's ardour had considerably ebbed. Once we organised a fox-hunt. Vladimir Ilyich was greatly interested in the whole enterprise. "Very skilfully thought out," he said. We placed the hunters in such a way that the fox ran straight at Vladimir Ilyich. He grasped his gun and the fox, after standing and looking at him for a moment,

turned and made off into the wood. "Why on earth didn't you fire?" came our perplexed inquiry. "Well, he was so beautiful, you know," said Vladimir Ilyich.

Late in the autumn, when the snow had not yet begun to fall but the rivers were already freezing, we went far up the streams. Every pebble, every little fish, was visible beneath the ice, just like some magic kingdom. And winter-time, when the mercury froze in the thermometers, when the rivers were frozen to the bottom, when the water, flowing over the ice, quickly froze into a thin upper ice-layer—one could skate two *verst*s or so with the upper layer of ice crunching beneath one's feet. Vladimir Ilyich was tremendously fond of all this.....

In the evenings he usually read either books on philosophy—Hegel, Kant, and the French naturalists—or, when very tired, Pushkin, Lermontov or Nekrassov.

When Vladimir Ilyich first came to Petersburg, and I knew of him only from hearsay, Stepan Ivanovich told me that Vladimir Ilyich only perused serious books and had never read a single novel in his life. I wondered at this. Afterwards, when I came to know him more intimately, we somehow or other never once spoke about this matter, and it was only in Siberia that I found out that this was all a pure legend. Vladimir Ilyich not only read, but many times re-read, Turgenev, L. Tolstoy, Chernyshevsky's *What is to be done?* and in general had a fine knowledge of, and admiration for, the classics. He had an album which contained, besides photographs of relatives and old political exiles, pictures of Zola, Herten, and several photos of Chernyshevsky.\*

The post came twice a week. There was extensive correspondence. Anna Ilyinichna (Lenin's sister—TRANS.) wrote about everything, and comrades wrote from Petersburg. Among other matters, Nina Alexandrovna Struve wrote me about her little son: "he can already hold his head up and every day we take him up to the portraits of Darwin and Marx, and say: nod to Uncle Darwin, nod to Uncle Marx, and he nods in such a funny way." We also received letters from distant places of exile, from Martov in Turukhansk, from Orlov in the Vyatka Gubernia, and from

\*He was particularly fond of Chernyshevsky. On one photograph of Chernyshevsky is an inscription in Vladimir Ilyich's handwriting: born (such-and-such a date), died 1889. See Appendix: *Lenin and Chernyshevsky* and *The Kind of Fiction that Pleased Ilyich*.

Potressov. But most of all were letters from comrades scattered throughout neighbouring villages. From Minussinsk (which was fifty *vershs* from Shushenskoye) came letters from the Krzhizhanovskys and Starkov; thirty *vershs* away, at Yermakovsk, lived Lepeshinsky, Vaneyev, Silvin and Panin—a comrade of Oscar's. Seventy *vershs* away, at Tess, were Lengnik, Shapoval, and Baramzin, while Kurnatovsky lived at a sugar mill. We corresponded on every conceivable subject. On Russian news, on plans for the future, on books, on new tendencies, on philosophy. We even wrote about chess matters, especially to Lepeshinsky. Games were played by correspondence. Vladimir Ilyich used to set up the chessmen, and sit for hours working out problems. At one time he was so taken up by chess that he even cried out in his sleep: "If he puts his knight here, I'll stick my rook there!"

Both Vladimir Ilyich and Alexander Ilyich were great chess enthusiasts from childhood. Their father also played. "At first father used to win," Vladimir Ilyich related to me. "Then my brother and I got hold of a chess manual and began to beat father. Once—when our room was upstairs—we met father coming out of the room with a candle in his hand, and the manual under his arm. Then he went and studied it."

On his return to Russia, Vladimir Ilyich abandoned chess-playing. "Chess gets hold of you too much, and hinders work." And as he did not like to do anything by halves, but devoted his entire energy to whatever he undertook, he sat down unwillingly to a game of chess even for recreation or while in exile.

From his early youth Vladimir Ilyich was capable of giving up whatever activity hindered his main work. "When I was a schoolboy," he told me, "I used to go in for skating, but found that it tired me so that I always wanted to go to sleep afterwards. This hindered my studies. So I gave up skating."

"At one time," he related on another occasion, "I was very much taken up with Latin." "Latin?" I asked, with some surprise. "Yes, only it began to hinder other work, so I gave it up." Only recently, in reading *Lef*,<sup>9</sup> I came across an article dealing with the style and structure of Vladimir Ilyich's speech. It alluded to a resemblance between the construction of Vladimir Ilyich's phrases and those of the Roman orators, and to a similarity in oratorical method. I then understood how it was that he had been able to become so captivated by the study of the Latin writers.

We not only corresponded with other comrades in exile, but sometimes, though not often, met them.

Once we went to see Kurnatovsky. He was a fine comrade and a very erudite Marxist, but had had a very difficult life. A hard childhood—cast out by his father. Then exile after exile, prison after prison. He would hardly be at work a month when he was again snapped up and sent away for long years. He did not know what real life was. One little incident illustrating his nature has remained in my memory. We were passing by the sugar-mill where he was employed. Two little girls were walking along, one older and the other very small. The big one carried an empty pail and the younger one a pail full of beetroots. "Fancy making the little one carry that," said Kurnatovsky to the elder girl, "you ought to be ashamed." But the girl only looked at him wonderingly. We also went to Tess. We received once a letter—I think from the Krzhizhanovskys—to the effect that ".....the District Police Chief is wild with us Tessites for having made some protest or another, and won't allow us to go anywhere. There are mountains at Tess of geological interest. Write and say you want to explore them." For a joke, Vladimir Ilyich wrote an application to the Police Chief, requesting not only to be allowed to go to Tess, but also financial assistance for himself and wife. The Police Chief sent a permit by express messenger. We hired a horse and trap for three roubles. The woman assured us the horse was strong, was no "gobbler," and needed little oats. And so we rolled on to Tess. Although our horse was not "a gobbler," it stopped dead when we were half-way there. But we nevertheless did reach Tess. Vladimir Ilyich conversed with Lengnik on Kant, and with Baramzin about the Kazan study-circles. Lengnik, who had a lovely voice, sang to us. In general, memories remain from that expedition particularly pleasant.

We went a couple of times to Yermakovskoye. Once it was to pass a resolution on the "*Credo*"<sup>10</sup>. Vaneyev was seriously ill with phthisis and was dying. They carried his bed into the big room where all the comrades were gathered. The resolution was passed unanimously.

The other time we went there it was to bury Vaneyev.\*

Among the "Decembrists" (see Ref. Note 6) two were early put out of action: Zaporozhetsk, who lost his reason in prison, and

\*A. A. Vaneyev's funeral took place on September 22nd, 1899.

Vaneyev, who died from illness contracted in prison. Both of them had given their lives when the flame of the workers' movement hardly begun to glow.

In the new year, we went to Minussinsk, where all the exiled Social Democrats had gathered. At Minussinsk there were also "Narodnaya Volya" exiles. These old chaps bore an attitude of mistrust towards the social-democratic youth. They did not believe them to be real revolutionaries. On these grounds, an "exile scandal" had taken place in the Minussinsk district just prior to my arrival at Shushenskoye. At Minussinsk there had been a social-democratic exile named Raitchin, who came from the borderlands and was connected with the Emancipation of Labour group. He decided to make his escape. They provided him with money for the flight, but the day of the flight had not yet been decided on. But Raitchin, on receiving the money, got into such a state of nerves that he made his escape without informing any of the comrades. The old men of the "Narodnaya Volya" accused the Social Democrats of having known of Raitchin's escape without warning them about it, and that there might be police searches before they had time to "clean up." The "scandal" grew like a snowball. When I arrived, Vladimir Ilyich talked to me about it. "There is nothing worse than these exile scandals," he said. "They pull us back terribly. These old men have got bad nerves. Just look what they've been through, the penal sentences they have undergone. But we cannot let ourselves be drawn away by such scandals—all our work lies ahead, we must not waste ourselves on these affairs." And Vladimir Ilyich insisted that we should break with these old people. I remember the meeting at which the rupture took place. The decision as to the break had been made beforehand. It was now a question of carrying it out as painlessly as possible. We made the break because a break was necessary. But we did it without malice, indeed with regret. And so we lived afterwards in separation.

Generally speaking, exile did not pass by so badly. Those were years of serious study. The nearer we approached the end of the period of exile, Vladimir Ilyich gave more and more thought to future work. News from Russia was very scant. Economism there had grown and become stronger. For all practical purposes there was no Party, and no printing press. The attempt to arrange publishing activity through the *Bund*<sup>21</sup> had failed. Meanwhile to



restrict ourselves to writing popular pamphlets without expressing ourselves on the fundamental questions of our work was no longer possible. The most complete dispersion prevailed in our work; repeated arrests made all continuity impossible. People went as far as talking about the "*Credo*," and even to the lengths of *The Workers' Thought*, which printed a letter from a worker evidently taken in by the propaganda of the Economists. This correspondent wrote: "We workers don't need your Marx or Engels....."

L. Tolstoy wrote somewhere that travelling the first part of a journey one usually thinks about what is left behind, and on the second half about what is waiting ahead. It is the same thing in exile. On the first period we spent more time summing up the results of the past. On the second half we thought more about what lay ahead. Vladimir Ilyich concentrated his thoughts more and more on what was to be done in order to bring the Party out of its present state, what was to be done to direct the work along the right course, to assure a correct social-democratic leadership of the Party. How were we to start? In the last year of his exile Vladimir Ilyich conceived the organisational plan which he subsequently developed in *Iskra*, in the pamphlet *What is to be done?* and in the *Letter to a Comrade*. It was necessary to begin with the organisation of an all-Russian newspaper, to establish it abroad, to connect it up as closely as possible with activities in Russia, and to arrange transport in the best way possible. Vladimir Ilyich began to spend sleepless nights. He became terribly thin. It was these nights that he thought out his plan in every detail, discussed it with Krzhizhanovsky, with me, corresponded about it with Martov and Potressov, conferred with them about the journey abroad. The more time went on, the more Vladimir Ilyich was overcome with impatience, the more eager he was to get to work. And here again we were surprised by a police search. They had taken from somebody a receipt for a letter sent to Vladimir Ilyich. The letter contained reference to a monument to Fedosseev [One of the pioneers of revolutionary Marxism in Russia—TRANS.], and the gendarmes made this an excuse for an official search.\* They found the letter, and it proved to be very innocent. They looked

\*This search was carried out on May 14th, 1899. The letter to which the author alludes was written to Lenin by Y. M. Lyakovsky from Verkholensk, and received by Lenin in the early part of December 1898. The receipt for this letter was found during the search at J. M. Zobin's in March 1899.

over our correspondence and also found nothing interesting. In accordance with an old Petersburg custom we kept all illegal literature or correspondence separate. It was true, however, that this lay in the bottom shelf of the cupboard. Vladimir Ilyich gave the gendarmes a bench to stand on so that they could start the search from the upper shelves, which were filled with various books of statistics—and they got so tired that they did not even look at the bottom shelf, being satisfied with my statement that it only contained my teaching text-books. The search ended without any complications, though we feared they might make this an occasion for adding a few years to our term of exile. In those days escapes were still not such common occurrences as in later times. In any case it would have complicated matters had we tried that course. For, prior to going abroad, it was necessary to undertake extensive organisational work in Russia. All went well, however, and our term was not increased.

In February 1900 when, Vladimir Ilyich's exile came to an end, we left for Russia. Pasha, who in those two years had become a real beauty, shed torrents of tears that night. Minka was fidgety and carried home all the paper, pencils and other stationery we left behind. Oscar Alexandrovich, who came and sat on the edge of a chair, was evidently deeply moved. He brought me a present, a hand-made brooch in the form of a book, inscribed "Karl Marx," in memory of our joint studies of *Capital*. The house-wife and neighbours kept looking into the room to see what was going on. Our dog wondered what was meant by all this hubbub, and kept opening all the doors with her nose to see that everything was still in its place. Mother busied herself with the packing, coughing from the dust, while Vladimir Ilyich tied up his books in a business-like manner.

We reached Minussinsk, where we had to pick up Starkov and Olga Alexandrovna Silvina. All our brothers in exile were gathered there. We were in the mood that usually prevailed when any of the exiles went back to Russia: everybody was thinking about when and whither he himself would go, and how he would work. Vladimir Ilyich had already previously discussed the matter of collaboration with all those who were also about to return to Russia. He arranged with those remaining as to future correspondence. Everybody was thinking about Russia—yet we talked about all kinds of trivialities.

Baramzin was giving sandwiches to Zhenka, who had been left him as a heritage. But the dog took no notice of him. She lay at mother's feet, not taking her eyes off her and following her every movement.

At last, equipped in felt boots, elk-skin coats, and the rest, we started on our journey. We went on horseback 300 *verssts* along the Yenissei day and night—thanks to the moonlight, which lit up everything. Vladimir Ilyich carefully wrapped us up at every stopping-place, looking round to see whether we had forgotten anything. He joked with Olga Alexandrovna, who felt the cold intensely. We kept hurrying on the whole of the journey, and Vladimir Ilyich—who travelled without elk-skin cloak, as he assured us he was hot in them—stuck his hands into a muff borrowed from mother, and let his thoughts wander to Russia, where it would be possible to work at will.

On the day of our arrival at Ufa we were met by the local people—A. D. Tsyurupa, Svidersky, Krokmal. "We have been to six hotels....." said Krokmal, all out of breath, "and at last have found you."

Vladimir Ilyich stayed a couple of days at Ufa, and after having talked with our people and entrusted me and mother to comrades, moved on farther—nearer to Petersburg. Of these two days there only remains in my memory a visit to the old Narodnaya Volya member, Chetvergova, whom Vladimir Ilyich had known in Kazan. She had a bookshop in Ufa. On the first day Vladimir Ilyich went to see her, and his voice and face seemed to become particularly gentle as he talked with her. When later I read what Vladimir Ilyich wrote at the end of *What is to be done?* I remembered that visit.

"Many of them"—(referring to the young Social Democrat leaders of the Labour Movement), wrote Vladimir Ilyich in *What is to be done?*—"commenced their revolutionary thinking as Narodovolists. Nearly all of them in their early youth enthusiastically worshipped the terrorist heroes. It was a great wrench to abandon the captivating impressions of these heroic traditions and it was accompanied by the breaking off of personal relationships with people who were determined to remain loyal to *Narodnaya Volya* and for whom the young Social Democrats had profound respect." This paragraph is a piece of the biography of Vladimir Ilyich.

It was a great pity to have to part, just at a time when "real"

work was commencing. But it did not even enter Vladimir Ilyich's head to remain in Ufa when there was a possibility of getting nearer to Petersburg.

Vladimir Ilyich went to stay at Pskov,\* where Potressov and L. N. Radchenko and his children subsequently lived. Vladimir Ilyich once laughingly related how Radchenko's little daughters Zhenyurka and Lyuda used to tease him and Potressov. Placing their hands behind their backs they paced solemnly up and down the room side by side, one saying "Bernstein" and the other replying "Kautsky."

There, at Pskov, Vladimir Ilyich was busily engaged weaving the network of the organisation which was to assure a close contact between the future Russian newspaper to be published abroad and activities in the homeland. He had interviews with Babushkin and a great many others.

Little by little I became acclimatised to Ufa, made arrangements for translations, obtained lessons.

Just before my arrival in Ufa there had been one of those "exile scandals." In one camp were Krokhtal, Tsyurupa and Svidersky—in the other the Plaxin brothers, Saltykov and Kviatkovsky. Chachina and Aptekman remained neutral and maintained relations with both groups. I was nearer to the first group, with whom I soon became associated. This group was carrying on some kind of work, and in general was the most active section of the fraternity. Contacts had been established with the railway workshops, where there was a circle of twelve Social Democrat workers. The most active was the workman Yakutov. He sometimes came to see me to obtain pamphlets and to talk. For a long time he set out to "pulverise" Marx, and having done so was quite unable to read it through. "There is no time," he complained to me. "The peasants keep coming to me, you know, with all their worries. You've got to talk with every one of them, so that they won't think bad of you—and that's where the time goes." He told me that his wife Natasha was also sympathetic, and that no sentence of exile could frighten them. He would never get stranded for hands would feed him everywhere. He was a great conspirator and particularly abhorred all gush, boasting, or fine words. Everything had to be done on a sound basis, noisily but firmly.

\*Lenin arrived in Pskov on March 10th, 1900.

In the 1905 Revolution, Yakutov was President of the Republic that was set up at Ufa. Later, in the years of reaction, he was hanged in Ufa Jail. He died in the prison yard and the whole prison sang—they sang in every cell—and vowed they would never forget his death, and never forgive it.

I also studied with other workers: a young fitter from a small factory used to come and tell me about the life of the local workers, in a heated and nervy manner. I was afterwards told that he went over to the Socialist Revolutionaries, and lost his reason in prison.

Then there was a tubercular bookbinder, named Krylov. He assiduously fabricated double-bindings into which one could stow away illegal manuscripts; or he stuck manuscripts together so as to serve as the boards used in binding. He told me all about the work of the local printers.

Later, these reports served as the basis for correspondence sent to *Iskra*.

Besides in Ufa proper, our work was carried on in neighbouring works. At the Ust-Katavsky works the factory surgeon was a Social Democrat. She conducted propaganda among the workers there, distributing illegal popular literature, of which there was a devilish insufficiency.

There were several Social Democrat students attached to the various works. Our Ufa organisation also maintained at Ekaterinburg in a state of illegality the worker Mazanov, who had returned from Surukhansk, where he had been in exile together with Martov. But somehow the work with him did not progress.

Ufa was the centre for the Gubernia (province). Exiles in Sterlitamak, Birsik, and other neighbouring towns always obtained permission to go to Ufa.

But apart from this, Ufa lay on the road from Siberia to Russia. Comrades returning from exile came in to arrange about work. Among callers were Martov (who had not been able to get away at once from Turukhansk), G. I. Okulova, and Panin. L. M. Knippovich ("little uncle") came illegally from Astrakhan, while Romyantsiev and Portugalov arrived from Samara.

My father used to live at Poltava. Contact with him was essential, and I hoped to receive literature through him. The literature arrived, I think, a week after my departure from Ufa. Kvyatkovsky, who went to fetch it, was treated to five years in

Siberia, by reason of this box being broken on the journey! In reality he had not carried on any activity, but had undertaken to receive the parcel merely because it was addressed to a certain brewery, and he used to give lessons to the brewer's daughter.

At Ufa were also the Narodnaya Volya members, Leonovich and later Borozdich.

Just before leaving for abroad Vladimir Ilyich escaped another sentence by a very near shave. He arrived in Petersburg from Pskov, together with Martov. They were followed and arrested.\* In his waistcoat pocket were two thousand roubles which he had received from "Auntie" (A. M. Kalmykova), and a list of contacts with abroad, written on notepaper in chemical ink. As a matter of form, something or other of no importance—I believe, some calculations—was written on this paper in ordinary ink. If the gendarmes had thought of holding this sheet of paper before the fire, Vladimir Ilyich would never have been able to set up the all-Russian newspaper abroad. But he "struck lucky," and in ten days was released.

He then came to say good-bye to me at Ufa. He told me about all he had been able to do during this time, talked to me about the people whom he had chanced to meet. Naturally, on the occasion of a visit from Vladimir Ilyich, there were a number of meetings. I remember that when it transpired that Lenovich, who considered himself to be a nihilist, did not know the Emancipation of Labour Group even by name, Vladimir Ilyich was furious: "As if a revolutionary could be unaware of it, as if he can consciously choose the Party he is going to work with if he doesn't know, doesn't study what has been written by the Emancipation of Labour Group."

I believe Vladimir Ilyich stayed about a week in Ufa then.

He wrote to me from abroad, mainly inside books that were addressed to various people in the same town. In general, things were not going as quickly with the paper as Vladimir Ilyich had wanted them. It was difficult to come to terms with Plekhanov, and the letters from Vladimir Ilyich were short, unhappy, and ended: "I will tell you when you arrive," or "I have written down for you in detail all about the conflict with Plekhanov."

\*Vladimir Ilyich came to Petersburg illegally together with Martov on June 2nd, 1900. The next day they were arrested in the street, outside No. 11b Kazachny Street. On June 13th V.I. was released, after which he went to Podolsk, whence, on June 20th, he journeyed to Ufa to N. Kapskaya. He went abroad on July 29th, 1900.

I could hardly wait for the end of my exile, and what is more, there did not seem to have been any letters from Vladimir Ilyich for a long time. I wanted to go to Astrakhan to see "the little uncle" (L. M. Knippovich), and was in a great hurry.

Mother and I called at Moscow to see Maria Alexandrovna, Vladimir Ilyich's mother. She was then alone in Moscow. Maria Ilyinichna<sup>12</sup> was in prison, and Anna Ilyinichna was abroad.

I was very fond of Maria Alexandrovna. She was always so thoughtful and attentive. Afterwards, when we lived abroad and she wrote letters, she always wrote to us jointly, never to Vladimir Ilyich alone. This was only a trifle, but what thoughtfulness there was in that trifle. Vladimir Ilyich had great affection for his mother. "She has tremendous will-power," he once said to me, "if that had happened to my brother when father was still alive, Lord knows what she might not have done."

It was from his mother that Vladimir Ilyich inherited his strength of will, as also he inherited her kindness and her attention for people.

While we lived abroad, I endeavoured to describe to her our life in as realistic a way as possible, so that she could at least feel a little nearer to her son. When Vladimir Ilyich was in exile in 1897 the papers contained the obituary notice of Maria Alexandrovna Ulyanova, who had died in Moscow. Oscar told me: "I went to Vladimir Ilyich and he was as white as a sheet—'my mother is dead,' he said." But that proved to be the obituary of some other M. A. Ulyanova.

A great deal of sorrow fell to the lot of Maria Alexandrovna—the execution of her eldest son, death of her daughter Olga, and the continual arrests of the other children. When Vladimir Ilyich fell ill in 1895, she immediately went to nurse him, and herself cooked his food. When he was arrested, she was again at her post. She sat for hours in the dimly lit waiting-room at the Preliminary Detention House; took parcels on visiting days; and her lips trembled but slightly.

I promised her I would look after Vladimir Ilyich, but I did not succeed.....

From Moscow I accompanied my mother to Petersburg, where I arranged things for her and then made my way across the frontier. I travelled on this journey looking purposely like an innocent provincial going abroad for the first time. I went to Prague, thinking

that Vladimir Ilyich lived there under the name of Modraczek.

I sent a telegram and arrived in Prague. But no one came to meet me. I waited and waited. Greatly disconcerted I hailed a top-hatted cabby, piled him up with baskets and started off. Arriving in the working-class district, we took a narrow turning and stopped at a large tenement building, the windows of which revealed a multitude of mattresses put out for airing.....

I climbed to the fourth floor. A little white-haired Czech woman opened the door. "Modraczek," I repeated, "Herr Modraczek." A worker came out and said: "I am Modraczek." Flabbergasted, I stammered: "No, my husband is!" Modraczek finally tumbled to what had happened. "Ah, you are probably the wife of Herr Rittmeyer. He lives at Munich, but sent books and letters to you at Ufa through me." Modraczek ran around with me the whole of that day. I told him about the Russian movement, and he told me of the Austrian. His wife showed me some lace she had made, and they fed me with Czech "klösse" (Rissoles).

Arrived in Munich\*—I travelled in a fur coat, and at that time in Munich people were already going about in dresses only—having learned by experience, I left my baggage in the station cloak-room and went by tram to find Rittmeyer. I found the house, and Apartment No. 1 turned out to be a beershop. I went to the counter, behind which was a plump German, and timidly asked for Herr Rittmeyer, having a presentiment that again something was wrong. "That's me," he said. "No, it's my husband," I faltered, completely baffled.

And we stood staring at one another like a couple of idiots, until Rittmeyer's wife walked in and, looking at me, guessed what was the matter: "Ach, you must be the wife of Herr Meyer. He is expecting his wife from Siberia. I'll take you to him."

I followed Frau Rittmeyer out through the backyard of a big house into a kind of uninhabited apartment. The door opened, and there at a table sat Vladimir Ilyich, his sister Anna Ilyinichna, and Martov. Forgetting to thank the landlady I cried: "Why the devil didn't you write and tell me where I could find you?"

"Didn't write to you!" exclaimed Vladimir Ilyich. "Why, I've been going three times a day to meet you. Where have you sprung from?" We afterwards ascertained that the friend, to

\*N. Krupskaya arrived in Munich about the middle of April.



whom had been sent a book containing the Munich address, kept the book to read!

Many of us Russians went on a wild-goose chase in a similar fashion. Shlyapnikov at first went to Genoa instead of Geneva, Babushkin, instead of going to London, had been about to start off for America.

### III

#### MUNICH, 1901-1902

Although Vladimir Ilyich, Martov, and Potressov all went abroad with legal passports, it was decided to live in Munich under false papers, away from the Russian colony, so as not to compromise any of our collaborators arriving from Russia. It was also easier for sending illegal literature into Russia in trunks, letters, and so forth.

When I arrived in Munich, Vladimir Ilyich was living with this Rittmeyer, unregistered and under the name of Meyer. Although Rittmeyer owned a beer-shop, he was a Social Democrat, and sheltered Vladimir Ilyich in his apartment. Vladimir Ilyich had a small, badly furnished room, and lived in a bachelor style, having his meals at a German woman's, who fed him on *Mahlspeise*. Morning and evening he drank tea out of a tin mug which he himself washed thoroughly and hung up on a nail by the tap.

He wore a worried look, for everything had not turned out as he had wanted. Besides Vladimir Ilyich, Martov, Potressov, and Vera Zassulich were living at that time in Munich. Plekhanov and Axelrod wanted the paper to be published somewhere in Switzerland, under their direct management. They, and at first Zassulich also, did not attach particular importance to *Iskra* ("The Spark"), and completely under-estimated the rôle it was destined to play; they were much more interested in *Zarya* ("Dawn").

"Your *Iskra* is silly," Vera Ivanovna said, jokingly, at the beginning. This, it is true, was only said for fun, but it revealed a certain under-estimation of the whole enterprise. Vladimir Ilyich thought it necessary for *Iskra* to be something apart from the emigrant centre, that it should be run secretly, which was of great importance for connections with Russia, for correspondence, and for the arrival of people from Russia. But the "old men" were ready to see in this an unwillingness to transfer the paper to Switzerland, unwillingness for their leadership, a desire to conduct some line of our own—and they were not particularly eager to help.

Vladimir Ilyich sensed this, and got worried. He used to have a special feeling towards the Emancipation of Labour Group. Not to mention Plekhanov, he was affectionately attached to Axelrod and Vera Zassulich. "Wait till you see Vera Ivanovna," Vladimir Ilyich said, the first evening I arrived in Munich—"there's a person as clean as crystal." And it was the truth.

Vera Ivanovna, alone of the Emancipation of Labour Group, came close to *Iskra*. She lived with us both in Munich, and in London, lived the life of the *Iskra* editorial staff, experienced its joys and its sorrows, lived on the tidings from Russia.

"And now *Iskra* is becoming important," she would say, as the influence of the paper grew and extended. Vera Ivanovna often used to tell us about the long, cold years of emigration. We never experienced the kind of life in emigration that the Emancipation of Labour Group had known. We always were in closest contact with Russia, and people from there were continually coming to us. As regards being kept informed as to what was going on, we were in a much better position than had we been in some provincial town in Russia itself. We were interested exclusively in the activities in Russia. Things there were going well, the Labour movement was growing. The Emancipation of Labour Group lived a life separated from Russia. They had been living abroad during the years of blackest reaction, when a student arriving from Russia was quite an event. Indeed, people were afraid to go abroad.

When in the 'nineties Klasson and Korobko went abroad to visit that group, they were summoned before the police immediately on their return, and asked why they had gone to see Plekhanov. Surveillance was organised very thoroughly. Of all the members of the Emancipation of Labour Group Vera Ivanovna felt the most lonely. Both Plekhanov and Axelrod had families. Vera Ivanovna spoke more than once of her loneliness: "I have nobody close to me," and immediately trying to hide the poignancy of her feelings, she bantered: "But you love me, I know. And when I die you'll say—dear me, we're drinking one cup of tea less....."

Indeed, she greatly needed family life—perhaps because she herself had been brought up in another family, as a ward. One only had to see how lovingly she treated the pale little son of "Dimka" (P. G. Smidovich's sister). Vera Ivanovna even became a good housewife, carefully purchasing the provisions when

her turn came to cook dinner for the "communal" (in London, Vera Ivanovna, Martov, and Alexeyev ran a communal household). But few people would have guessed the qualities Vera Ivanovna possessed as family woman and house-keeper. She lived in nihilist fashion—dressed carelessly, smoked endlessly, and extraordinary disorder reigned in her room. She never allowed anybody else to tidy it up. She also ate in a rather fantastic manner. I remember how she once cooked herself some meat on an oil-stove, clipping off pieces to eat with a pair of scissors.

"When I lived in England," she related, "the English ladies wanted to engage me in conversation. 'How long do you cook your meat?' 'It just depends,' I replied. 'If I am hungry I cook it ten minutes; if I am not hungry, about three hours.' And they left off after that."

When Vera Ivanovna was writing she shut herself in her room and fed on strong black coffee alone.

Vera Ivanovna yearned very much for Russia. I think it was in 1899 she went to Russia illegally, not to work, but simply because "I must take a look at the *mujik* and see what his nose has grown like." And when the *Iskra* began to appear she felt that this was a real piece of Russian work and clung on to it grimly. To her, leaving *Iskra* would have meant once more becoming isolated from Russia, once more beginning to sink into the dead sea of *émigré* life, that drags one to the bottom.

It was for that reason that, when the question of the editorship of *Iskra* was brought up at the Second Congress, she revolted. For her it was not a question of self-love, but a question of life or death.

In 1905 she went to Russia and remained there.

At the Second Congress Vera Ivanovna opposed Plekhanov for the first time in her life. She was attached to Plekhanov by long years of joint struggle. She saw what a tremendous rôle he had played in guiding the revolutionary movement along correct channels. She valued him as the founder of Russian social democracy, valued his intelligence, his brilliant talent. The slightest disagreement with Plekhanov worried her terribly, but in this instance she went against him.

The destiny of Plekhanov was tragic. In the theoretical sphere his services to the Labour movement were very great. But the years of emigration were not without effect on him. They isolated

him from the real life of Russia. The Labour movement of the broad masses only developed after he had already gone abroad. He saw the representatives of various parties, writers, students, and even individual working men, but he neither saw nor worked nor felt with the Russian labouring masses. When any correspondence happened to come from Russia that lifted the curtain over new forms of the movement, and made one grasp its perspectives, Vladimir Ilyich, Martov, and even Vera Ivanovna, would read and re-read the letters: Vladimir Ilyich would afterwards pace up and down for a long while, and could not get off to sleep. When we moved to Geneva, I endeavoured to show Plekhanov correspondence of this kind, and the way he reacted astonished me: he seemed to lose the ground beneath his feet, and a look of mistrust appeared to come over his face. Afterwards he never talked about those letters.

Plekhanov became particularly mistrustful of letters from Russia after the Second Congress.

At first I was somewhat offended at this; but afterwards I began to think out the reason for his attitude. He had long since left Russia, and he did not possess that gauge—fashioned by experience—which makes it possible to grasp the relative value of each letter, to read a great deal between the lines.

Workers often came to the *Iskra*, and they all of course wanted to see Plekhanov. To get in to see Plekhanov was much more difficult than to see us or Martov, but even if a worker succeeded in seeing him he came away feeling confused. The worker would be enthralled with Plekhanov's brilliant intelligence, his knowledge, and his wit, but somehow it seemed that, on leaving him, he would feel only what a great gap there was between this brilliant theoretician and himself. Of the things he had wished to speak about, or seek his advice on, the worker would not say a word.

And if the worker did not agree with Plekhanov and tried to expound his own opinion, Plekhanov began to be annoyed: "Your fathers and mothers were still walking under the table [still infants—TRANS.] when I—"

I dare say things were not like this in the first years of emigration, but by the beginning of the present century Plekhanov had already lost all capacity for directly sensing Russia. In 1905 he did not go to Russia.

Pavel Borisich Axelrod, to a much greater extent than

Plekhanov or Vera Zassulich, was an organiser. His job had more to do with the interviewing of new arrivals. They spent more time at his place as they were given food and drink there, and Pavel Borisich questioned them about everything.

He conducted correspondence with Russia, and understood the conspiratorial methods of communication. But one could easily imagine what it felt like to be a Russian revolutionary organiser—after long years of emigration in Switzerland! Pavel Borisich had lost three-quarters of his working capacity; he did not sleep for nights at a stretch and wrote with extreme intensity for months on end, without being able to finish the article he had started. Sometimes it was impossible to decipher his handwriting owing to the nervy way in which it was written.

Axelrod's handwriting produced a profound impression on Vladimir Ilyich. "It's simply awful," he often used to say, "if you get into such a state as Axelrod." He more than once spoke about Axelrod's handwriting to Dr. Kramer, who treated him during his last illness. When Vladimir Ilyich first arrived abroad\* he talked most of all with Axelrod on organisational questions. He told me a good deal about Axelrod when I first came to Munich. And even when Vladimir Ilyich himself was unable, not merely to write, but to speak a word [in 1923—TRANS.], he asked me, by showing me Axelrod's name in a newspaper, what he was doing then.

P. B. Axelrod was particularly pained by the fact that *Iskra* was not published in Switzerland, and that the stream of communications with Russia did not pass through him. That is why he took up such an angry attitude at the Second Congress towards the question of the editorial triumvirate. *Iskra* was to be the organising centre and *he* removed from the editorial! And this was when, at the Second Congress, more than at any other time, the breath of Russia could be felt.

When I arrived in Munich, only Zassulich, of the Emancipation of Labour Group, was living there. She had a Bulgarian passport and went under the alias of Velika Dmitrievna.

All the others had to live under Bulgarian passports. Until my arrival, Vladimir Ilyich did without a passport altogether. When I arrived we obtained the passport of some Bulgarian, a Dr. Jordanov, added thereto a wife, Maritza, and hired a room in a

\*In 1895.

working-class family through an advertisement. Before I came, the secretary of *Iskra* had been Inna Hermogenovna Smidovich-Leman. She also had a Bulgarian passport, and was nicknamed "Dimka." When I arrived, Vladimir Ilyich told me that he had succeeded in arranging that I should be made secretary of *Iskra* on my arrival. This of course meant that contact with Russia would be carried on under the closest control of Vladimir Ilyich. Martov and Potressov had nothing against this then, and the Emancipation of Labour Group did not put up their own candidate; indeed, they attached little importance to *Iskra* at that time. Vladimir Ilyich told me it had been rather awkward for him to have to arrange this, but that he considered it necessary for the good of the cause. I was immediately snowed under with work. This is how the business was organised: letters from Russia were sent to various towns in Germany, and addressed to German comrades. The latter sent them all on to the address of Dr. Leman, who forwarded everything to us.

Not long since there had been a considerable hitch. In Russia we had ultimately succeeded in setting up a printing press for pamphlets at Kishinev. The manager, Akim (brother of Lieber—Leon Goldman), sent to Leman's address a cushion in which were sewn up copies of pamphlets published in Russia. The perplexed Dr. Leman unwittingly refused to accept the cushion from the post. However, when our people found out and raised the alarm, he went to fetch the cushion, and told them he would now accept whatever was sent in his name—even if it were a whole trainload.

There was not yet any means of transporting *Iskra* into Russia. *Iskra* was circulated mainly in double-bottomed trunks taken by Sunday travellers. They took these trunks to various prearranged places in Russia, to be called for.

Such appointed places were at Pskov (the Lepeshinskys), Kiev, and elsewhere. The Russian comrades turned the literature out of the trunks and handed it on to the organisation. Carriage had also just been arranged through the Letts, Rolau and Skubik.

All this took up a great deal of time. Much time was also spent on all kinds of negotiations from which nothing afterwards resulted.

I remember how a whole week went in negotiations with some individual who wanted to get into touch with smugglers who travelled the frontier with photographic implements, which he

wanted us to buy for him.

We corresponded with *Iskra* agents in Berlin, Paris, Switzerland and Belgium. They helped us in whichever way they were able, finding people willing to take trunks, obtaining money, contacts, addresses, and so forth.

In October 1901, what was known as the League of Russian Social Democrats Abroad was formed out of sympathising groups.

Contacts with Russia grew very quickly. One of the most active *Iskra* correspondents was the St. Petersburg workman Babushkin, whom Vladimir Ilyich had interviewed prior to leaving Russia to arrange about correspondence. He sent a heap of letters from such places as Orekhovo-Zuevo, Vladimir, Gus-Khrustalny, Ivanovo-Voznessensk, Kokhma and Kineshma.

He continually called at these towns, and strengthened the contacts with them. Letters also came from Petersburg, Moscow, the Urals, and the South. We conducted correspondence with the Northern League.<sup>18</sup> A representative of the League, Noskov, arrived after a while from Ivanovo-Voznessensk. It would be difficult to imagine a more thorough-going Russian type. Blue-eyed, sallow-faced, rather round-shouldered, he spoke with a broad provincial accent. He had crossed the frontier with a small bundle with a view to discussing everything. His uncle, a small Ivanovo-Voznessensk manufacturer, gave him the money to go abroad, if only to get rid of a troublesome nephew who was continually being either run in or being searched by the police. Boris Nikolavich (his real name and patronymic was Vladimir Alexandrovich, the other being his alias) was a fine practical worker. I had previously met him at Ufa, when he passed through on the way to Ekaterinburg. He came abroad for "contacts." It was his profession to collect contacts. I remember how he had sat on the stove in our tiny little Munich kitchen and with gleaming eyes told us about the work of the Northern League. He got terribly worked up by his narration, and Vladimir Ilyich, with his questions, only added fuel to the flame. Boris, while he lived abroad, kept a note-book in which he carefully wrote down all contacts: where they lived, what they did, how they could be useful. He afterwards left us these contacts. But he was rather a poetical kind of organiser. He over-idealised people and activities, and was not capable of looking realities fearlessly in the face. After the



Second Congress he became a conciliator, and later seemed to disappear from the political arena. In the years of the reaction he died.

Other people also came to Munich. Struve had been there prior to my arrival. At that time things were already heading for a rupture with him. It was then that he was passing over from the social-democratic to the Liberal camp. The last time he came, there was considerable friction. Vera Ivanovna bestowed upon him the title "shod calf." Vladimir Ilyich and Plekhanov both counted him as finished. Vera Ivanovna, however, thought there was still some hope for him. As a joke we called her and Potresov the "Struve freundliche Partei" ("Friendly-to-Struve Party").

Struve came the second time, when I was already in Munich. Vladimir Ilyich refused to see him. I went to see Struve at Vera Ivanovna's apartment. The interview was very distressing. Struve was terribly offended. The atmosphere was as tense as a scene from Dostoevsky. He was talking dramatically about his being considered a renegade, and other things in a similar strain, generally making a fool of himself. I no longer remember exactly what he said, but only the depressing feelings with which I left that meeting. It was clear that he was not one of us—that he was a person hostile to the Party. Vladimir Ilyich had been right. Later Struve's wife, Nina Alexandrovna, sent greetings and a package with marmalade. I forget who brought it. But she was weak and it is doubtful if she understood whither Pyotr Bernhardovich was drifting. He knew, though.

After my arrival we went to live with a German working-class family. It was a big family—six of them. They all lived in the kitchen and a small room. But everything was scrupulously clean. The kiddies were both clean and polite. But I decided to put Vladimir Ilyich on home-cooked food. So I organised the cookery. I used the landlady's kitchen for cooking in, but had to prepare everything in our own room. I tried to make as little noise as possible, as Vladimir Ilyich was then beginning to write *What is to be done?* When he wrote anything he generally paced briskly from one corner of the room to the other and whispered what he was about to write. By that time I had already become used to his manner of working. When he was writing I never spoke to him about anything, nor asked him anything. Afterwards, when we went out for a walk, he told me what he was writing, and

what he was thinking. It seemed to become a necessity to whisper an article over to himself, before writing it. We used to go for rambles on the outskirts of Munich, choosing the most desolate spots where there were fewer people.

After a month we moved into our own quarters in Schwabing, a suburb of Munich. We took one of the many newly built houses, installing our own "furniture" (we sold it all for twelve marks when we left), and lived in our own fashion.

As soon as we were settled, the first to arrive—after dinner—was Martov. Then others came in, and the so-called meeting of the "editorial" took place. Martov spoke interminably, and kept on switching from one subject to another. He read masses of literature, and always obtained a heap of news from somewhere. He knew everybody and everything. Vladimir Ilyich often referred to Martov as "a typical journalist. He is extraordinarily talented, seems to catch everything in the wind, awfully impressionable, but he is all on the surface." Martov was absolutely indispensable for *Iskra*. Vladimir Ilyich used to get exceedingly tired, however, from these daily five-or six-hour talks. He made himself quite ill with them, and incapable of working. He once asked me to go and see Martov and ask him to stop visiting us. It was agreed that I should call on Martov, report to him on letters received and arrange things with him. But Martov could not exist without these talks. After leaving us he went with Vera Ivanovna, Dimka, and Blumenfeld\* to a café, where they sat for hours.

Later Dan arrived, with his wife and children. Martov began to spend whole days with them.

In October we went from Munich to Zurich to unite with the *Rabocheye Delo*.<sup>14</sup> No unity was attained, however. Akimov, Krichevsky, and the rest argued until they were blue in the face. Martov became terribly heated in his attack on the *Rabocheye Delo*-ites, and even tore his tie from his throat. That was the first time I had seen him in such a state. Plekhanov bristled with wit. A resolution was drawn up recording the impossibility of unity.

\*Blumenfeld set up the type for *Iskra*, first at Leipzig and then at Munich in German social-democratic printing presses. He was an excellent compositor and fine comrade. He was very enthusiastic about his work. He had great affection for Vera Ivanovna, and was always very considerate about her, but did not get on very well with Plekhanov. He was a comrade upon whom one could absolutely rely. Whatever he undertook, he did.

It was read out at the conference by Dan, in a wooden voice, accompanied by shouts of "papal nuncio" from the opposition.....

We got over that split quite painlessly. Martov and Lenin had in any case not collaborated on the *Rabocheye Delo*. There was actually no rupture because there had never been joint work. Plekhanov was in a very good mood, for he had dealt a knockout blow to an opponent he had fought so much. Plekhanov was both jolly and communicative.

We lived in the same hotel, ate together, and the time seemed to go particularly well. Only occasionally a slight element of difference arose in the approach to certain questions.

I remember one conversation. Adjoining the café where we were sitting there was a gymnasium where fencing was in progress. Some workers in head-shields were fencing with wooden swords. Plekhanov laughed: "We also will fight like that under the new order." When we were returning home I walked with Axelrod, who developed the theme started by Plekhanov: "Under the new state of society there won't be any fights at all—only deadly boredom."

At that time I was still terribly shy, and did not say anything, but I remember I was amazed at such a statement.

After we returned from Zurich, Vladimir Ilyich got down to the job of finishing *What is to be done?* Later, the Mensheviks vehemently attacked *What is to be done?* but at this juncture the book captivated everyone, especially those more closely in touch with Russian work. The whole pamphlet was an impassioned appeal for organisation. It put forward a complete organisational plan, in which everybody could find a place, could become a cog in the revolutionary machine, a cog without which, small though it might be, no progress could be made. The pamphlet called for plodding, tireless work to build that foundation so essential for the Party in the conditions then prevailing, if it was to exist not in words but in deeds. "A Social Democrat must not be afraid of long, work. He must work and work without leaving off. He must be ever-ready to do anything—whether it be to save the honour, prestige and pre-eminence of the Party at the time of the greatest revolutionary 'depression,' or whether it be to prepare, plan, and carry out a nation-wide armed rising," wrote Vladimir Ilyich in *What is to be done?*

Twenty-four years have passed since that pamphlet was written

—years in which the entire conditions of Party work have changed. The workers' movement is confronted with quite different tasks, yet even now the revolutionary enthusiasm of this booklet is catching. Even now it must be studied by everyone who wants to be a Leninist in practice, and not in words alone.

Whereas *Friends of the People* was of tremendous importance for determining the path the revolutionary movement had to take, *What is to be done?* provided a plan for extensive revolutionary work. It pointed out definite jobs to be done.

It was clear that a Party Congress was still premature, that there was no reason why it should not hang fire, like the First Congress had. Prolonged preparatory work was necessary. The Congress summoned by the Bund at Belostok was therefore not taken seriously by anybody. Dan went there from *Iskra*, taking a trunk crammed full of copies of *What is to be done?* The Belostok Congress was transformed into a Conference.

*Iskra* was working at full steam. Its influence was growing. The Party programme<sup>15</sup> was being prepared for Congress. Plekhanov and Axelrod came to Munich to discuss it. Plekhanov criticised certain parts of the draft programme drawn up by Lenin. Vera Ivanovna was not in agreement with Lenin on all points, but neither was she in entire agreement with Plekhanov. Axelrod also sided with Lenin on some points. It was a depressing meeting. Vera Ivanovna wanted to reply to Plekhanov, but he took up an intransigent pose and, folding his arms, gave her such a look that she became quite confused.

Vladimir Ilyich became extremely agitated. To work like that was impossible. What kind of a business-like discussion was that!

There was glaring need for the work to be organised on sound lines, for keeping out the personal element, and for assuring that decisions were not influenced by capriciousness or by personal relations associated with the past.

Vladimir Ilyich was greatly pained at any difference with Plekhanov. He grew restless and did not sleep at nights. And Plekhanov was angry and pceevish.

After reading through Vladimir Ilyich's article for the fourth number of *Zarya*, Plekhanov returned it to Vera Ivanovna with annotations in the margins in which he gave vent to all his spleen. When Vladimir Ilyich had read them he became greatly agitated and

paced up and down, up and down.

It then transpired that it was no longer possible to print *Iskra* at Munich, as the owner of the printing press did not want to undertake the risk. We had to choose a new home. Where? Plekhanov and Axelrod favoured Switzerland. The remainder—who had caught a whiff of the atmosphere at the discussion on the programme—voted for London.

Afterwards, these Munich days came to our memories as a particularly bright period. Our experiences during subsequent years in emigration were much more distressing. In the Munich period, there was still not such a deep gulf in the personal relations between Vladimir Ilyich, Martov, Potressov, and Zassulich. All forces were concentrated on one object—the creation of an all-Russian-newspaper. The collection of forces around *Iskra* was pursued intensively. Everyone felt the growth of the organisation, was conscious that the line for the formation of the Party had been correctly laid down. Hence, these extraordinarily good-humoured days.....

Local life did not attract our attention particularly. We observed it in an incidental manner. We went sometimes to meetings, but they were seldom of much interest. I remember the First of May celebrations. That year the German Social Democrats were permitted for the first time to organise a procession, on condition that they did not form crowds in the town, but arranged the celebrations in the country-side. We saw fairly big columns of German Social Democrats with their wives and children, and pockets bulging with radishes. In dead silence they marched briskly through the town—to drink beer at a country beer-garden. This May-day celebration did not at all resemble a demonstration of working-class triumph throughout the world.

As we observed strict secrecy, we did not meet any of the German comrades. We only used to see Parvus, who lived near us at Schwabing with his wife and little boy. Once Rosa Luxemburg came to see him, and then Vladimir Ilyich went to meet her there. Parvus was then an extreme left-winger, contributed to *Iskra*, and was interested in Russian affairs.

We went to London via Liège. At that time Nikolai Leonidovich Meshcheryakov and his wife—old Sunday-school friends of mine—were living there. When I had first known him he was still a nihilist, but he was the first to initiate me into illegal

work, the first to teach me the rules of conspiracy, and helped me to become a Social Democrat, eagerly supplying me with the foreign publications of the Emancipation of Labour Group.

Now he was a Social Democrat, and had already long been living in Belgium. He had an excellent knowledge of the local movement, and we decided to call and see them *en route*.

Just at that time there happened to be tremendous excitement in Liège. A few days previously the troops had fired on strikers. The agitation was apparent in the working-class districts on the workers' faces and in the groups of people standing about. We went to look at the House of the People. It stood on a very unsuitable site. The crowd could easily be hemmed in on the square facing the house, just as in a trap. The workers flocked to the House of the People. In order to prevent too many people accumulating there, the Party leaders arranged meetings in all working-class districts. There appeared to be a certain mistrust of the Belgian Social Democrat leaders. There seemed to them to be a division of labour: the troops fired on the crowds, while the labour leaders sought a pretext for pacifying them.....

## IV

### LIFE IN LONDON, 1902-1903\*

We were astounded at the tremendous size of London. Although it was exceedingly dismal weather on the day of our arrival, Vladimir Ilyich's face immediately brightened up, and he began casting curious glances at this stronghold of Capitalism, forgetting for the while Plekhanov and the editorial conflicts.

We were met at the station by Nikolai Alexandrovich Alexeyev, a comrade living in London in emigration and who had a fine knowledge of English. At first he acted as our guide, as we were in a rather hopeless position ourselves. We thought we knew the English language, having even translated a whole book (the Webbs') from English into Russian, when we were in Siberia. I learnt English in prison from a self-instructor, but had never heard a single live English word spoken. When we started translating Webb at Shushenskoye, Vladimir Ilyich was appalled at my pronunciation. "My sister used to have an English teacher," he said, "but it didn't sound like that." I did not argue, but started learning again. When we arrived in London we found we could not understand a single word, and nobody understood us. At first this was very comical, but although Vladimir Ilyich joked about it, he soon got down to the business of learning the language. We started going to all kinds of meetings. We stood in the front row and carefully studied the orator's mouth. We went fairly often to Hyde Park, where speakers harangued the passing crowds on diverse themes. An atheist, standing among a group of curious listeners, proved there was no God. We were particularly keen on listening to one speaker of this kind. He spoke with an Irish accent, which was easier for us to understand. Nearby a Salvation Army officer uttered hysterical shouts in appeal to God Almighty, while a little farther on a shop-assistant was holding forth on the hours of servi-

\*Vladimir Ilyich arrived in London in April 1902 (see *Letters of P. B. Axelrod and L. Martov*, Vol. I, pp. 79 and 81, Berlin, 1923).

tude of assistants in the big stores.....We learnt a great deal by listening to spoken English. Afterwards, by means of an advertisement, Vladimir Ilyich found two Englishmen desirous of exchanging lessons, and began studying assiduously with them. He got to know the language fairly well.

Vladimir Ilyich also studied London. He did not, however, explore the London museums, except the British Museum, where he spent half his time. But there, he was attracted, not by the museum, but by the richest library in the world, and the conveniences it afforded for scientific study. Ordinary museums bored Vladimir Ilyich. In the Ancient History Museum he showed signs of unusual fatigue after the first ten minutes. We generally passed very quickly through the rooms hung with mediæval armour and the endless wings filled with Egyptian and other ancient vases. But I remember one little museum from which Vladimir Ilyich could not tear himself away. This was the Museum of the 1848 Revolution in Paris in the Rue des Cordeliers, where he examined each little item, every single drawing, with profound interest. For him it was a fragment of the living struggle. When I have visited our own Museum of the Revolution, in Moscow, I have imagined Ilyich standing there, drinking in every detail.

Ilyich studied living London. He loved going long rides about the town on top of an omnibus. He liked the movement of this huge commercial city. The quiet squares, the detached houses, with their separate entrances and shining windows, adorned with greenery, the drives frequented only by highly polished broughams were much in evidence—but tucked away nearby, the mean little streets, inhabited by the London working people, where lines with washing hung across the street, and pale children played in the gutter—these sights could not be seen from the bus-top. In such districts we went on foot, and observing these howling contrasts in richness and poverty, Ilyich would mutter through clenched teeth, and in English: "Two nations!"

But even from the top of an omnibus it was possible to view many characteristic scenes from the life of the people. Standing outside public-houses were groups of bloated and bedraggled lumpen-proletarians, in whose midst might be observed some drunken woman with a black eye and a torn and trailing velvet dress of the same colour.....We once saw from the top of a bus a powerful "bobby"—typical in his helmet and chin-strap—holding



before him in an iron grasp a little urchin who had evidently been caught pilfering, and a whole crowd following with shouts and whistles in his wake. Some of the people on the bus also stood up and shouted things at the little thief. Vladimir Ilyich just murmured "humph!" Once or twice we went for a bus ride in a working-class district on pay-day evening. Ranged along the pavement of a wide street was an endless row of stalls, each illuminated by a flare. The pavements were thronged with crowds of working men and women, who were noisily purchasing all kinds of things and assuaging their hunger on the spot. Vladimir Ilyich was always attracted by working-class crowds. He went wherever they were to be found. He went on outings, where tired workers, glad to be away from the city, lounged for hours on the grass. He also visited public-houses and reading-rooms. In London there were reading-rooms with direct entry from the street, which were without even sitting accommodation, merely having stands to which were attached current files of the newspapers. At a later period, Ilyich remarked that he would like to see such reading-rooms established all over Soviet Russia. We also went to a little public restaurant—and to church. In the English churches the service is generally followed by a sermon, or in socialistic churches by a lecture and discussion. Vladimir Ilyich was very fond of listening to these discussions, as rank-and-file workers took part in them. He searched the papers for advertisements of working-class meetings in out-of-the-way districts, where there was no ostentation, no leaders, but merely workers from the bench—as we now term them. The meetings were usually devoted to the discussion of some such question as a garden-city scheme. Ilyich would listen attentively and afterwards joyfully exclaim: "Socialism is simply oozing from them. The speaker talks rot, and a worker gets up and immediately, taking the bull by the horns, himself lays bare the essence of Capitalist Society." Ilyich always placed his hope on the rank-and-file British workman who, in spite of everything, preserved his class instinct. People travelling to England generally notice merely the labour aristocracy who have been corrupted by the bourgeoisie and themselves become petty-bourgeois. Ilyich of course studied also this upper stratum and the concrete forms which this bourgeois influence assumed. But while not forgetting for one moment the significance of this fact, he also endeavoured to feel the pulse of the motive forces of

England's future Revolution.

There is no recounting the strange variety of meetings we attended at one time or another. We once wandered into a social-democratic-church. The Socialist in charge first read aloud, his nose glued to a Bible, and then preached a gospel something like this: The exodus of the Jews from Egypt symbolised the exodus of the workers from the Kingdom of Capitalism into the Kingdom of Socialism. Everyone stood and sang from a socialist hymn-book: "Lead us, O Lord, from the Kingdom of Capitalism into the Kingdom of Socialism." Another time we went to that same Seven Sisters church to confer with the youth. A young man read a paper on municipal socialism, arguing that a revolution was not necessary at all. And the Socialist who had acted as the priest when we paid our first visit to Seven Sisters church declared that he had been twelve years in the Party, and for twelve years fought against opportunism—and municipal socialism was opportunism pure and simple!

We did not know much about the home life of the English Socialists. The English are a reserved people. They regarded the Bohemian life of the Russian *émigrés* with a naïve perplexity. I remember the questions put to me by an English Social Democrat whom we once met at the Takhtarievs. "Have you really been in prison? If my wife were put in prison I don't know what I'd do, I'm sure. Just think of it, my wife in prison!" How strongly entrenched this petty-bourgeois mentality was we were able to observe in the family where we had lodgings, and from the two Englishmen who exchanged lessons with us. Here we sampled to the full the whole bottomless inanity of English petty-bourgeois life. One of the Englishmen who came to us for lessons, and who was manager of a large book-shop, declared that he thought Socialism was the most correct theory of evaluation. "I am a confirmed Socialist," he said. "At one time I even made socialist speeches. Then my boss sent for me and said that Socialists were no use to him, and if I wanted to remain in his employ I would have to keep my tongue between my teeth. I considered it, and realised that Socialism would come inevitably, irrespective as to whether I advocated it or not—and I have a wife and children. Now I no longer tell anybody I am a Socialist, but I can tell you."

This Mr. Raymond, who had been nearly all over Europe, had lived in Australia and elsewhere, and had been for years in Lon-

don, had not even seen half what Vladimir Ilyich had managed to look at during his one year's stay there. Ilyich once took him to some meeting at Whitechapel. Like the majority of Londoners, Mr. Raymond had never visited this part of the town, populated by Russian Jews, who lived their own kind of life unlike that of the rest of the city. It quite astonished him.

It was also our custom to ride out to the suburbs. Most often we went to Primrose Hill, as the whole trip only cost us sixpence. Nearly the whole of London could be seen from the hill—a vast smoke-wreathed city receding into the distance. From here we got close to nature, penetrating deep into the parks and along green paths. We also liked going to Primrose Hill because it was near the cemetery where Karl Marx was buried. We paid visits there.

In London we met a member of our Petersburg group, Appollinaria Alexandrovna Yakubova. In the Petersburg days she had been very active and was much valued and liked by everyone. I had been particularly friendly with her as we had both worked in the same Sunday Adult School beyond the Nevsky. We were also mutual friends of Lydia Mikhailovna Knippovich. After escaping from exile, Appollinaria married Takhtariev, who was formerly editor of the *Rabotchaya Mysl* ("Workers' Thought"). They were now living in London as emigrants, and had dropped out of Party activities. Appollinaria was overjoyed at our arrival. The Takhtarievs took us under their guardianship, helped us to get fixed up in cheap and fairly convenient quarters.\* We frequently met the Takhtarievs, but as we avoided all reference to the *Workers' Thought* tendency, there was a certain tension in our relations. Once or twice there was a rupture, followed by reconciliations. Finally, I think in January 1903, the Takhtarievs officially announced their sympathy with the *Iskra* tendency.

Soon my mother was due to arrive and we decided to live in family style, i.e., to hire two rooms and eat at home. For we had found that the Russian stomach is not easily adaptable to the "ox-tails," skate fried in fat, cake, and other mysteries of English fare. What is more, we were at that time on the payroll of our organisation, which meant we had to look after every penny and live as cheaply as possible.

\*At No. 30 Holford Square, London, W.C., where Lenin and his wife lived from January 1903 until they left London.—Ed.

From the conspiratorial point of view things could not have been better. No identification documents whatever were needed in London then, and one could register under any name. We assumed the name of Richter. Another advantage was the fact that to English people all foreigners looked the same, and our landlady took us for Germans the whole time.

After a while Martov and Vera Zassulich arrived and set up a communal household together with Alexeyev in one of the big continental-looking houses not far away from us. Vladimir Ilyich lost no time in arranging to work at the British Museum.

He generally went there first thing in the morning. While he was gone Martov came and we opened and discussed the mail. In this manner Vladimir Ilyich was relieved of a large proportion of wearying routine-work.

The conflict with Plekhanov was somehow ended. Vladimir Ilyich went away for a month to Brittany, to see his mother and Anna Ilyinichna, and spend the time with them by the sea. He loved the sea, with its continuous movement and endless expanse. He could really rest there.

In London people immediately began to come and see us. We had a visit from Inna Smidovich ("Dimka"), who soon afterwards left for Russia. Another visitor was her brother, Peter Hermogenovich, whom, at the instance of Vladimir Ilyich, we christened "The Matron." He had just done a long stretch in prison. On his release he became a fervent "Iskra-ite." He considered himself a great expert at faking passports. He contended that the best method was to smear them with sweat. At one time all the tables in our "commune" were turned upside down to serve as presses for faked passports. The whole of this technique was extremely primitive, as was all our secret work in those days. In reading now the correspondence with Russia, carried on in those days, one marvels at the naïve forms of our conspiratorial work. All those letters about hand-kerchiefs (passports), brewing beer, warm fur (illegal literature), all those code-names for towns—beginning with the same letter as the name of the town ("Ossip" for Odessa, "Terenty" for Tver, "Petya" for Poltava, "Pasha" for Pskov, etc.), all this substituting of women's names for men's, and vice versa—all this was transparent in the extreme. It did not seem so naïve to us then, however, and did to a certain extent succeed in covering up the traces. In those earlier days *agents-*

*provocateurs* were not so abundant as they were later on. All our people were trustworthy and well known to one another.

In Russia the work was carried on by *Iskra* agents. They were supplied from abroad with copies of *Iskra* and *Zarya*, and with pamphlets. These agents arranged for *Iskra* literature to be reprinted in illegal printing presses and for it to be distributed to the various committees. They likewise saw that *Iskra* was well supplied with correspondence, and that the paper was kept informed as to all the illegal work being conducted in Russia. They also collected funds for the paper.

In Samara ("at Sonia's") lived the Krzhizhanovskys ("Gnawers"), Gleb Maximilianovich ("Clair"), and Zinaida Pavlovna ("the Snail"). Maria Ilyinichna ("the Young Bear") also lived there. (See Ref. Note No. 12). Samara soon became a kind of centre. The Krzhizhanovskys had a special capacity for grouping people around them. Lengnik ("Kurzh") went to live in the South, at Poltava ("at Petyas"). Lydia Mikhailovna Knippovich ("little uncle") still lived in Astrakhan. At Pskov were Lepeshinsky ("the Shoe") and Lyubov Nikolaevna Radchenko ("Pasha"). By that time, Stepan Ivanovich Radchenko had become thoroughly tired out, and gave up illegal work. But his brother, Ivan Ivanovich (also known as "Arcady" and "Cassian"), worked unceasingly for *Iskra*. He was a travelling agent. Another agent who took *Iskra* all over Russia was Silvin ("the Wanderer"). Working in Moscow was Baumann (alias "Victor," "the Tree," "the Rook"), and in close contact with him Ivan Vassilyevich Babushkin (alias "Bogdan"). Another agent who was also closely connected with the Petersburg organisation was Yelena Dmitrievna Stassova (known also as "Absolute" and "the Residue"). *Iskra* carried on active correspondence with all these agents. Vladimir Ilyich looked through every letter. We had a detailed knowledge of what the various *Iskra* agents were doing, and discussed all their work with them. When connections between them broke down we put them in contact with one another again, informed them as to breakdowns, etc.

There was a printing press doing *Iskra* work at Baku. Work was carried on under conditions of utmost secrecy. The brothers Yenukidze were employed there, and business was directed by Krassin ("the Horse"). The press was named "Nissa."

Later we tried to run another press in the North (the Akulina

Press), but it very soon fell through. The former illegal printing press at Kishinev, which had been run by Akim (Leon Goldman), had already broken down by the time we were in London.

Transportation was organised through Vilna (through "Green"). The Petersburg comrades tried to arrange transport through Stockholm. Concerning this traffic, which functioned under the title of "beer," there was endless correspondence. We used to dispatch literature to Stockholm by the pood and were informed that the "beer" had arrived. We were sure it was being received in Petersburg and went on sending literature to Stockholm. Later, in 1905, on returning to Russia via Sweden, we discovered that the "beer" was still in the "brewery," or in other words our literature had filled a whole cellar in the Stockholm "People's Home."

"Small barrels" were sent through Vardo. Only once, I believe, was a parcel received, then the traffic got out of order. We also dispatched to "the Matron" at Marseilles, whose duty it was to arrange carriage through cooks working on ships going to Batum. At Batum the reception of literature was organised by the Baku comrades ("the Horses"). Most of this literature was thrown into the sea. (It was wrapped up in waterproof packing, lowered into the water at an agreed spot, and fished out by our comrades.) Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin,<sup>18</sup> who was then working in a Petersburg factory and was a member of our organisation, handed on to us (through Stassova) the address of a sailor at Toulon. Literature was also carried by way of Alexandria (Egypt) and transport arranged via Persia. Afterwards we organised traffic through Kamenetz-Podolsk and Lvov (Galicia). Although a heap of money, energy, and time was put into all this transportation work, and tremendous risks were entailed, probably not more than one-tenth of the literature dispatched arrived at its destination. We also used double-bottomed trunks and book-bindings. When our literature did arrive, it was eagerly snapped up.

The pamphlet *What is to be done?* was particularly successful. It supplied the answer to a number of the most essential and most pressing questions. Everyone felt very keenly the need for a conspiratorial and systematically working organisation.

In June 1902 there took place at Belostok the Conference of the Bund ("Boris") (see Ref. Note No. 11), where the police rounded up everyone with the exception of the Petersburg delegate. It was

in connection with this that Baumann and Silvín got caught. At this conference it was decided to form an organisational committee to convene the Party Congress. The matter, however, dragged on indefinitely. It was necessary for the local committees to be represented, but these were still of a very unformed and heterogeneous nature. In Petersburg, for instance, the organisation was split up into a workers' committee ("Manyá") and an intellectual committee ("Vanya"). The main duty of the workers' committee was to lead the economic struggle and of the intellectuals' to conduct high politics! As a matter of fact this "high politics" was rather feeble, being more like Liberal than revolutionary politics. This kind of structure had arisen out of Economism. This tendency (concentration on economic work to the neglect of the political side), although defeated in principle, still remained firmly entrenched in the localities. *Iskra* estimated this structure at its true value. Vladimir Ilyich played a special rôle in the struggle for correct organisational structure. His *Letter to Yerm*, better known as *Letter to a Comrade* (of this anon), was of exceptional significance in the matter of organising the Party. It helped to strengthen the working-class character of the Party, to draw workers into the deliberations on all urgent political problems. It broke down the wall that the *Rabocheye Delo* (Workers' Cause) tendency (Economists) had erected between the working-class and intellectual comrades. In the winter of 1902-1903 there was a desperate struggle of tendencies. The *Iskra*-ites gradually won ground, but not without occasionally getting "knocked out."

Vladimir Ilyich directed the fight of the *Iskra* supporters, at the same time warning them against an over-simplified conception of centralism. He combated any tendency to discern "amateurishness" in every live example of self-activity. All this work of Vladimir Ilyich's which had such a profound influence on the quality of the committees is little known to the present younger generation. Yet it is just this that determined the character of our Party, that laid the basis of its present organisation.

The "Economists" of the *Rabocheye Delo* were particularly embittered by this struggle, as it deprived them of influence and they did not like "receiving orders" from abroad.

On August 6th Comrade Krassnukh arrived from Petersburg to negotiate on organisational questions. His password was "Have you read number 47 of the *Citizen*?" Henceforth he was

known to us under the pseudonym of "Citizen." Vladimir Ilyich talked with him a great deal about the Petersburg organisation and its structure. Another participant in this consultation was P. A. Krassikov (alias "Musician," "Hair-pin," "Ignatius," "Pancratius"), as also was Boris Nikolaevich Noskov (see page 59.) We sent "Citizen" from London to Geneva to talk with Plekhanov and to get finally "*Iskra*-fied." After a couple of weeks a letter arrived from Petersburg signed "Yerem," expressing views as to how the work should be organised locally. It was not clear from the letter whether "Yerem" was an individual propagandist or a group. But that was of no importance. Vladimir Ilyich began thinking out a reply. This reply grew into the pamphlet *Letter to a Comrade*. First it was run off on a duplicator and distributed, and later, in 1903, published illegally by the Siberian Committee.

At the beginning of September 1902 Babushkin arrived, after having escaped from Ekaterinoslav prison. His escape from prison and get-away across the frontier was furthered by the assistance of some schoolboys. They dyed his hair, which, after a while, turned crimson and attracted general attention. In Germany he fell into the hands of the commissioners, and only just avoided being deported to America. We fixed him up in the commune, where he lived during the whole time of his stay in London. By this time Babushkin had made great strides in his political knowledge. He was now a steeled revolutionary with his own opinions. He had an extensive experience of all kinds of working-class organisations and, being himself a worker, had nothing to learn as to how to approach the workers. When he had first come to the Sunday-school some years back, he was quite an inexperienced fellow. I remember one episode. At first he was in Lydia Mikhailovna Knippovich's group. They were learning Russian grammar and going over various examples. Babushkin wrote on the blackboard: "There will soon be a strike in our factory." After the lesson, Lydia called him aside and rebuked him: "If you want to be a revolutionist you must not make yourself conspicuous as one, but be able to use self-restraint....." Babushkin blushed, but afterwards came to regard Lydia as his best friend and often consulted her on our activities.

It was at that time that Plekhanov arrived in London. A joint meeting with Babushkin was arranged. Russian affairs were discussed. Babushkin had his own opinion, which he defended very



firmly. He was so tenacious that he began to impress Plekhanov. Georgi Valentinovich certainly began to look at him more attentively. But Babushkin spoke of his future work in Russia only with Vladimir Ilyich, with whom he was particularly intimate. I remember yet another small but characteristic incident. Two or three days after Babushkin arrived, we were astonished, on entering the commune, to find how clean everything was. All the litter was cleared up, newspapers neatly arranged on the table, and the floor swept. It appeared that Babushkin had been putting things in order. "The Russian intellectual is always dirty," said Babushkin. "He needs a servant as he is himself incapable of tidying up."

He soon left for Russia. We did not see him again after that. In 1906 he was caught in Siberia transporting arms, and along with other comrades was shot by an open grave.

While Babushkin was yet in London a whole group of *Iskra* comrades who had escaped from Kiev jail arrived. These were Baumann, Krokhlmal, Blumenfeld, Wallach (alias Litvinov, "Papasha"), and Tarsis (alias "Friday"). Blumenfeld had been incarcerated in Kiev jail after being caught on the frontier with addresses and a trunk full of literature that he was taking into Russia.

We had known that an escape from prison was being prepared in Kiev. Deutsch, who had only just appeared on the horizon, and was an expert on escapes and knew the conditions of Kiev jail, asserted that it was impossible. The escape was successful, however. Ropes, grappling irons, and passports were smuggled in from outside. During exercise the prisoners tied up the sentry and warder and climbed over the wall. The only one who did not escape was Silvin, who was last in turn, and had to hold the warder.

The days that followed that visit were very hectic.

In the middle of August a letter arrived from the editor of the *Yuzhnyi Rabochy* ("Southern Worker"), a popular illegal organ. They reported on various ventures that had fallen through in the South and stated that they wished to enter into the closest possible relations with the *Iskra* and *Zarya* organisation. They also announced their solidarity with our views. This of course was a big step forward in the direction of uniting forces. In the next letter, however, the *Yuzhnyi Rabochy* expressed disapproval of the severity of *Iskra's* polemics with the Liberals. Then they brought up the suggestion that the literary group of the *Yuzhnyi Rabochy*

should continue in the future to preserve its independence, etc. We began to feel that it would not be so easy to come to a final understanding.

At about that time we learned from Samara that Bronstein (Trotsky) had arrived there following his escape from Siberia. They said he was a fervent supporter of *Iskra* and produced a very good impression on everybody. "He is a real young eagle," wrote the Samara comrades. He was christened "the Pen" and was sent to Poltava to negotiate with the *Yuzhnyi Rabochy*. From these negotiations he got the impression that it was possible to work with these people and, he noted and accurately formulated the points on which the *Yuzhnyi Rabochy* differed: (1) under-estimation of the peasant movement; (2) dissatisfaction at the sharp polemics with the Liberals; (3) the desire to remain a separate group and publish their own popular organ.

Soon after—I believe in October—Trotsky arrived in London.

One morning there was a violent knocking at the front-door. I knew full well that if the knock was unusual it must be for us, and hurried downstairs to open the door. It was Trotsky, and I led him into our room. Vladimir Ilyich had only just awakened and was still in bed. Leaving them together, I went to see to the cabman and prepare coffee. When I returned I found Vladimir Ilyich still seated on the bed in animated conversation with Trotsky on some rather abstract theme. Both the hearty recommendations of the "young eagle" and this first conversation made Vladimir Ilyich pay particular attention to the new-comer. He talked with him a great deal and went walks with him.

Vladimir Ilyich questioned him as to his visit to the *Yuzhnyi Rabochy*. He was pleased with the definite manner in which Trotsky formulated the position. He liked the way Trotsky was able immediately to grasp the very substance of the differences and to perceive through the layer of well-meaning statements their desire, under the guise of a popular paper, to preserve the autonomy of their own little group.

Meanwhile the call came from Russia with increased insistence for Trotsky to be sent back. Vladimir Ilyich wanted him to remain abroad in order to learn and to help in the work of *Iskra*.

Plekhanov immediately looked on Trotsky with suspicion: he saw in him a supporter of the younger section of the *Iskra* editorial (Lenin, Martov, Potressov) and a pupil of Lenin. When

Vladimir Ilyich sent Plekhanov an article of Trotsky's he replied: "I don't like the pen of your 'Pen.'" "The style is merely a matter of acquisition," replied Vladimir Ilyich, "but the man is capable of learning and will be very useful." In March 1903 Vladimir Ilyich proposed co-opting Trotsky on the *Iskra* editorial board.

Soon after Trotsky went to Paris, where he began to advance with remarkable success.

A new arrival from exile in Olekma was Ekaterina Mikhailovna Alexandrova ("Jacques"). She was formerly a prominent member of the Narodnaya Volya, and this had left its imprint upon her. She was not at all like our impetuous, impulsive girls such as "Dimka," but was highly self-controlled. Now she had become a supporter of *Iskra*, and what she said carried very great weight. Vladimir Ilyich greatly esteemed the old revolutionists, members of the Narodnaya Volya. When Ekaterina Mikhailovna arrived, the fact that she had formerly belonged to the Narodnaya Volya and now joined *Iskra* no doubt considerably influenced his attitude towards her. As for me, I was extremely interested in everything about her. Before I had become a confirmed Social Democrat, I had gone to see the Alexandrovs (Olminskys) to arrange to take a workers' study-circle. I was tremendously impressed by the modest furniture, the stacks of statistical works piled up everywhere, Mikhail Stepanovich sitting in silence at the back of the room, and the impassioned appeals of Ekaterina Mikhailovna persuading me to join the Narodnaya Volya. I told Vladimir Ilyich about this before Ekaterina Mikhailovna arrived. We entered upon a phase of enthusiasm for her. Vladimir Ilyich was always having these periods of enthusiasm for people. He seemed to discern some valuable quality in a person and cling on to it.....Ekaterina Mikhailovna went on from London to Paris. She did not turn out to be a very stable supporter of the *Iskra* group. At the Second Party Congress she was not unconnected with that web of opposition that was being woven against Lenin's "capturing" tactics. Later she was on the Conciliatory Central Committee and afterwards left the political arena.

Among the comrades who came to London from Russia I also remember Boris Goldman ("Adèle") and Dolivo-Dobrovolsky ("the Depths"). I had known B. Goldman a long time ago in Petersburg, when he was working on technical production, printing the leaflets of the League of Struggle. (See Ref. Note No. 5). An

extremely changeable person, he was at this time a follower of *Iskra*. "The Depths" was an astoundingly silent man. He used to sit as quiet as a mouse. He returned to Petersburg, but after a while lost his reason. After becoming partly cured he shot himself. It was very difficult to live "underground" in those days, and not everybody had the strength to endure it.

The whole winter was taken up with intensive preparations for the Congress. In November 1902 the Organising Committee for Preparation of the Congress was constituted. (The Organising Committee included representatives of the *Southern Worker*, the Northern League, Krasnukh, I. I. Radchenko, Krassikov, Lengnik, and Krzhizhanovsky; the Bund at first abstained from representation.)

The title "Organising Committee" was very much to the point. Without such a committee it would have been impossible to organise the Congress. Under most difficult conditions of police persecution it was necessary to accomplish the complicated task of co-ordinating groups which were either newly formed in organisation and ideas, or else still in process of formation. What is more, the local groups in Russia had to be brought into the same scheme of organisation as the foreign centre. Actually, the entire work of communication with the Organising Committee and preparing the Congress lay on the shoulders of Vladimir Ilyich. Potressov was ill; his lungs could not stand the London fogs, and he was under treatment somewhere. Martov was wearied by London and its secluded life, and had gone to Paris, where he was stranded. Deutsch, an old member of the Emancipation of Labour Group who had escaped from exile, was to have come to London. The Emancipation of Labour Group had great hopes in him as a big organiser. "Wait till 'Zhenka' (Deutsch) comes," said Vera Ivanovna (Zassulich), "he will organise communications with Russia better than anybody else." Plekhanov and Axelrod also placed great hopes in him, reckoning on him as their representative on the editorial of *Iskra*, who would look after everything. When Deutsch arrived, however, it appeared that the long years of separation from Russian conditions had left their mark on him. He proved quite incompetent to handle communications with Russia. He hungered for human society and joined the League of Russian Social Democrats Abroad. He established wide contacts with the Russian colonies abroad, and soon left for Paris.

Vera Ivanovna (Zassulich) lived permanently in London. But although she listened eagerly to accounts of the work in Russia she was not capable of carrying on the work of communications. Everything lay on Vladimir Ilyich. The correspondence with Russia had a very bad effect on his nerves. To wait weeks, or even months, for answers to letters, to be continually expecting the whole business to fall through, to be in a constant state of ignorance as to how things were progressing—all this was extremely incompatible with Vladimir Ilyich's character. His letters to Russia were overflowing with requests to write accurately: "Once more we earnestly and categorically beseech and demand that you write us more often and in greater detail—in particular, do it *at once*, without fail, the very same day you receive this letter. Let us know you have received it, even if only a couple of lines....." His letters overflowed with requests to act more speedily. Ilyich would spend sleepless nights after receiving letters with such news as: "Sonia" is as silent as a grave," or "Zarin did not come to the Committee in time," or "no contact with the old woman."

Those sleepless nights remain engraved on my memory. Vladimir Ilyich longed passionately for the formation of a solid, united Party into which would be merged all the individual groupings whose attitude to the Party was at present based on personal sympathies or antipathies. He wanted a Party in which there would be no artificial barriers, particularly those of a national character. Hence the fight with the Bund. At that time the majority of the Bund took up the standpoint of the *Rabocheye Delo*. (See Ref. Note No. 13). Vladimir Ilyich was convinced that, while the Bund might preserve their autonomy on purely national matters, they would inevitably have to come into line with the Party. The Bund, however, wanted complete autonomy on all questions. They talked in terms of their own political Party, apart from the R.S.D.L.P., and only agreed to affiliate on a federal basis. Such tactics were suicidal for the Jewish proletariat. The Jewish workers could never be victorious singlehanded. Only by merging their forces with the proletariat of the whole of Russia could they become strong. But the "Bundites" did not understand this. That was why the *Iskra* editorial had to wage a fierce fight with the Bund. It was a fight for unity. The whole editorial board joined this issue, but the "Bundites" knew that the most impassioned advocate of unity was Vladimir Ilyich.

Soon the Emancipation of Labour Group again brought up the question of moving to Geneva, and this time Vladimir Ilyich was the only one to vote against going there. Preparations started for the journey. Vladimir Ilyich was so overwrought that he developed a nervous illness called "holy fire," which consists in inflammation of the nerve terminals of back and chest. When the rash appeared I referred to a medical handbook. By its nature it appeared to be "shearers' rash," Takhtarev, who had been a fourth- or fifth-course medical student, confirmed my supposition, and I painted Vladimir Ilyich with iodine, which caused him agonising pain. We could not think of going to an English doctor, as it would have cost a guinea. In England the workers often treated themselves at home since doctors were so costly. On the way to Geneva Vladimir Ilyich was very restless; on arriving there he broke down completely, and had to lie in bed for two weeks.

One piece of work in London which did not get on Vladimir Ilyich's nerves, but gave him a certain amount of satisfaction, was when he wrote the pamphlet *To the Village Poor*. The peasant risings of 1902 gave him the idea of the necessity of writing a pamphlet for the peasants. In this pamphlet he explained what the workers' Party aimed at, and why the poor peasants should go with the workers.

In April 1903 we shifted to Geneva.

# V

GENEVA, 1903

In Geneva we went to live in the working-class quarter, Sécheron, on the outskirts of the town. We occupied a small house. There was a big kitchen with a stone floor below, and three small rooms up above. The kitchen also served for receiving visitors. The deficiency in furniture was made up by the packing-cases that had been used for our books and crockery. Ignatius (Krassikov) used to tease us about our kitchen being a "smugglers' den." It was not long before we had no room to move. Whenever we had to have a confidential talk with someone we had to go to a neighbouring park or on the shore of the lake.

Some of the delegates now began to arrive. First the Dementievs. Kostya (Dementiev's wife) simply astounded Vladimir Ilyich by her knowledge of transportation work. "That's a real transporter!" he repeated. "She doesn't chatter, but acts." Another arrival was Liubov Nikolaevna Radchenko, with whom we were personally on very intimate terms. We talked for hours on end. Then the Rostov delegates arrived—Gussiev and Lokerman, then Zemlyachka, Shotman (Berg), "Little Uncle," "The Youth" (Dmitryi Ilyich<sup>17</sup>). Every day somebody turned up. We talked to the delegates about such questions as the Programme and the Bund, and listened to what they had to say on the matter. Martov was continually at our place and never tired of speaking to the delegates. Trotsky arrived. They had allowed even him to come back. The newly arrived Petersburg delegate, Shotman, was sent to stay with Trotsky for "training" purposes.

We had to explain to the delegates the position of the *Southern Worker* group, who, sheltering under the guise of a popular paper, wanted to reserve to themselves the right to maintain a separate existence. We had to explain that under conditions of illegality a popular paper could not become a mass organ, could not count on a mass circulation. The position of Vladimir Ilyich and Martov

on this question was defended by Trotsky, but attacked by Plekhanov. A meeting of delegates was held in the Café Landold and a discussion took place between Plekhanov and Trotsky. The delegates, most of whom had come into contact with the *Southern Worker* in Russia, considered Trotsky's position more correct. Plekhanov was beside himself.

All kinds of misunderstandings arose among the *Iskra* editorial board. The position became unbearable. The editorial was generally divided into two groups: Plekhanov, Axelrod, Zasulich on the one hand, and Lenin, Martov, Potressov on the other. Vladimir Ilyich again put forward the proposal, already mooted by him in March, that a seventh member, Trotsky, be co-opted on to the editorial. This co-option was not brought about, owing to the categorical protest of Plekhanov. Once Vladimir Ilyich returned from an editorial meeting in a terrific rage. "A damned fine state of affairs," he said. "Nobody has enough courage to reply to Plekhanov. Look at Vera Ivanovna! Plekhanov trounces Trotsky, and Vera just says: 'Just like our George. All he does is to shout.' I can't go on like this." For a time, prior to the Congress, Krassikov was co-opted: it was essential to have a seventh member on the board. At the same time Vladimir Ilyich began to think about the question of a triumvirate. This was a very painful problem, and nothing was said to the delegates about it. The fact that the *Iskra* editorial, as formerly constituted, was no longer fit to carry on the work was too depressing a thing to talk about.

Some of the delegates made complaints about the members of the Organising Committee. One was accused of being too abrupt, another of dilatoriness, yet another of passivity—and so on. There were also signs of discontent among *Iskra* being too fond of commanding. But the general view was that there were no real differences and that everything would go swimmingly after the Congress.

All the delegates had now arrived, with the exception of Clair and Kurz (Krzhizhanovsky and Lengnik.)



## VI

### THE SECOND CONGRESS, JULY-AUGUST, 1903

It had been previously proposed to hold the Congress in Brussels, and the first sessions were held there. At that time Koltsov, an old Plekhanovite, was living in Brussels, and he undertook to arrange everything. However, it did not prove so easy to organise the Congress in Brussels. The delegates were instructed to report to Koltsov. But after about four Russians had called to see him, the landlady told the Koltsovs that she would not stand any more of these visits, and if one more person came they would immediately have to clear out. So Koltsov's wife had to stand all day at the corner, catch the delegates, and send them off to the socialist hotel, "Coq d'Or" ("Golden Cock"), as I believe it was called.

The delegates overran this hotel in noisy groups; and Gussev, with a glass of cognac clutched in his hand, sang operatic arias every evening in such loud tones that crowds gathered beneath the windows. Vladimir Ilyich liked to hear Gussev singing, especially "We were wedded out of church....."

The secret venue of the Congress was changed at the last moment. The Belgian Party thought that for conspiratorial purposes it would be better to hold the Congress in a big flour warehouse. Our advent there not only disturbed the rats, but also the police. The word went round that Russian revolutionists were assembling for some mysterious conclave.

Forty-three delegates with decisive and fourteen with consultative vote attended the Congress. If one compares that Congress with those of the present day, at which large numbers of delegates represent hundreds of thousands of Party members, it seems very small. Yet it seemed a big Congress then. At the First Congress in 1898 there had only been eight persons present... One felt that a considerable advance had been made during these five years. The main thing was that the organisations which sent

these delegates were no longer semi-mythical, but already definitely formed and linked up with the workers' movement, now spreading so extensively.

How Vladimir Ilyich longed for this Congress! All his life—right to the last moment—he attached an exceptionally great significance to Party Congresses. He considered the Party Congress to be the highest authority. At the Congress all personalities should be discarded, nothing be concealed, and everything should be said openly. For Party Congresses Ilyich always made very thorough preparation, very carefully thinking out his speeches. The present-day youth, who do not know what it is to have to wait years before being able to discuss, jointly with the whole Party, the most pressing questions of Party policy and tactics, and who cannot realise the difficulties involved in convening an illegal Congress in those days—I doubt if they could completely understand this attitude of Ilyich's towards Party Congresses.

Plekhanov awaited the Congress just as eagerly as did Ilyich. It was he who opened the Congress. The big window of the flour warehouse, by the improvised platform, was hung with red material. Everyone was excited. The solemn speech of Plekharov resounded with unadulterated pathos. How could it be otherwise? The long years of emigration seemed to him to fade into the past. Now he was present at, was actually opening, the Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.<sup>18</sup>

In actuality the Second Congress was the inaugural one. It was here that the fundamental problems of theory were discussed and the foundations of Party ideology laid. At the First Congress the only things to be passed were the title of the Party and the Manifesto on the Formation of the Party. Right up to the time of the Second Congress there had been no Party Programme. The editorial board of *Iskra* prepared this Programme and discussed it extensively. Every word and every phrase was carefully weighed up and given a basis. Heated disputes took place. Correspondence on the Programme was carried on for months between members of the editorial, between the Munich section and the Swiss section. Many practical-minded people considered that these disputes were of a purely armchair nature, and that it did not matter a fig whether some such phrases as "more or less" remained in the Programme or not.

Vladimir Ilyich and I recalled a simile that L. Tolstoy used

somewhere: Once when walking, he spotted in the distance the figure of a man squatting on his haunches and moving his hands about in an absurd way; a madman, he thought—but on drawing nearer, he saw that it was a man sharpening his knife on the paving-stone. It is the same thing with theoretical controversies. Heard from aside, they do not seem worth quarrelling about, but once the gist is grasped, it is realised that the matter is of the utmost importance. It was like that with the Programme.

When the delegates began to arrive in Geneva the question of the Programme was discussed with them more than anything else, and in greater detail. This question went smoothest of all at the Congress.

Another question of great importance discussed by the Congress was that of the Bund. At the First Congress it was resolved that the Bund constitute a section of the Party although autonomous. During the five years that had ensued since the First Congress, the Party had not actually existed as a unified whole, and the Bund had carried on a separate existence. Now the Bund wanted to strengthen this autonomy and merely establish Federative relations with the R.S.D.L.P. The underlying cause of this tendency was the fact that the Bund, reflecting the mood of the handicraft workers of the Jewish provincial towns, was much more interested in the economic than the political struggle, and therefore had much more sympathy for the Economists than for *Iskra*. The question was, should there be in the country one strong united worker's Party, rallying closely around itself the workers of all nationalities living on Russian territory, or should there be several workers' Parties throughout the country, separated according to nationalities? It was a question of international solidarity inside the Party. *Iskra* stood for the international consolidation of the working class; the Bund for national autonomy and mere friendly contract relations between the national Labour Parties in Russia.

The question of the Bund was also discussed in detail with the arriving delegates, and also resolved on *Iskra* lines by an overwhelming majority.

Later, the fact of the split obscured from many the tremendous importance of the questions of principle that had been brought up and settled at the Second Congress. During the discussion of these problems Vladimir Ilyich felt particularly close to Plekhanov. Plekhanov's speech to the effect that the basic democratic principle

was "the well-being of the Revolution is the supreme law," and that even the idea of the universal franchise should be regarded from the viewpoint of this principle, produced a profound impression on Vladimir Ilyich. He remembered this when fourteen years later the Bolsheviks found themselves confronted foursquare with the question of dissolving the Constituent Assembly.

Another speech of Plekhanov's that was in accord with the ideas of Vladimir Ilyich was that concerning the significance of popular education as the "guarantee of the rights of the proletariat." At the Congress Plekhanov also felt the proximity to Lenin.

Replying to Akimov, an ardent supporter of the *Rabocheye Delo*, who was out to sow discord between Plekhanov and Lenin, Plekhanov said, jokingly: "Napoleon had a passion for getting his marshals divorced from their wives; some marshals gave way, although they loved their wives. Comrade Akimov in this respect is like Napoleon—he wants to divorce me from Lenin at all costs. But I am showing a stronger character than the Napoleonic marshals; I am not out to divorce Lenin, and I hope he does not intend divorcing me." Vladimir Ilyich smiled, and shook his head in the negative.

In discussing the first item on the agenda (the composition of the Congress) an unexpected incident arose over the question of inviting a representative of the Borba ("Struggle") Group (Ryazanov, Nevzorov, Gurevich, etc.). The Organising Committee wanted to put forward its own opinion to the Congress. The matter at issue was not the Borba Group itself, but the fact that the Organising Committee was trying to bind its members by its own discipline as apart from the Congress. The Organising Committee wanted to act as a group, previously deciding among themselves how they would vote, and speaking to the Congress as a group. In that way the supreme authority for a member of the Congress would be a group and not the Congress itself. Vladimir Ilyich was burning with indignation. "Pavlovich" (Krassikov), who rose to combat these tactics, was not only supported by Lenin, but also by Martov and others. Though the Organising Committee was dissolved by the Congress, this incident was noteworthy and foreshadowed further complications of all kinds. But this incident was relegated to the background in so far as questions of tremendous importance as to principle were now to be discussed, viz. the question of the place of the Bund in the Party and the question

of the Programme. On the question of the Bund and of the *Iskra* editorial both the Organising Committee and the local delegates acted in agreement. The representative of the *Southern Worker*, and member of the Organising Committee, Egorov (Levin), also definitely opposed the Bund. Plekhanov, during the interval, paid him compliments, and said that his speech should be "uttered from every house-top."

At the beginning of the Congress, Trotsky spoke very competently. He was then regarded by everyone as an ardent supporter of Lenin, and someone even nicknamed him "Lenin's cudgel." Indeed, Lenin himself at that time least of all thought that Trotsky would waver. The Bund were brought to their knees. It was firmly formulated that national peculiarities must not hinder the unity of Party work, the solidarity of the social-democratic movement.

About that time we had to shift to London. The Brussels police began to pester the delegates and even deported Zemlyachka and somebody else. Then we all packed up. In London, arrangements for the Congress were furthered in every way by the Takhtariyevs. The London police did not put up any obstacles.

We continued the discussion on the question of the Bund. Then, while the Programme question was being dealt with in commission, we passed on to the fourth item on the agenda—the ratification of the line of the Central organ. *Iskra* was unanimously recognised as such, with the abstentions by the *Rabocheye Delo* group. *Iskra* was fervently greeted. Even the representative of the Organising Committee "Popov" (Rozanov) said: "Here, at this Congress, we see a united Party, created to a great extent through the activity of *Iskra*." Akimov grumbled: "If we don't approve of the *Iskra* editorial board it will mean we only recognise a name." Trotsky replied: "We are not approving a name, Comrade Akimov, but a standard, the standard around which our Party will actually be built up!" That was the tenth session. There were thirty-seven altogether.

Gradually clouds began to gather over the Congress. We were about to elect the Central Committee triumvirate. A basic nucleus for the Central Committee was not yet discernible. The only indisputable candidature was that of Glebov (Noskov) who recommended himself as an untiring organiser. Another unchallenged candidature would have been that of "Clair" (Krzhizha-

novsky), had he been at the Congress. But he was not there. He and "Kurz" (Lengnik) had to be voted for by proxy, "on trust," which was by no means suitable. Meanwhile there were too many "generals" present at the Congress, who were candidates for the Central Committee. These included "Jacques" ("Stein," Alexandrova), "Fomin" (Krokhmal), "Stern" ("Kostya," Rosa Gabelstadt), "Popov" (Rozanov), and "Egorov" (Levin). All these were candidates for two vacancies on the Central Committee triumvirate. Besides this, everybody knew one another not only as Party workers, but knew about each other's personal lives. There was thus a whole network of personal sympathies and antipathies. The nearer the voting approached, the more tense became the atmosphere. The accusations launched by the Bund and the *Rabocheye Delo* about the foreign centre wanting to command, to dictate, and so on, although meeting with a concerted rebuff at the onset, now began to take effect. They had their influence on the Centre, on the waverers—though perhaps even unconsciously. Whose commands were being feared? Not, of course, those of Martov, Zassulich, Starover, and Axelrod. They were frightened of Lenin and Plekhanov commanding. But they knew that on the question of Russian work, and of the statutes, Lenin would be the determining factor, and not Plekhanov, who stood aside from practical work.

The Congress ratified the policy of *Iskra*, but still had to elect the editorial board.

Vladimir Ilyich moved that the editorial be composed of three persons. He informed Martov and Potressov of this proposal earlier. Martov defended among the delegates on their arrival the idea of an editorial of three as being the most businesslike idea. When Vladimir Ilyich handed Plekhanov a note, with his proposal as to the editorial, the latter said nothing and put it in his pocket. He understood what was afoot, but agreed about it. As long as there was a Party, practical work was necessary.

Martov, more than anyone else on *Iskra*, mixed with members of the Organising Committee. He was very soon persuaded that the triumvirate was directed against him, and that if he entered it he would be letting down Zassulich, Potressov, and Axelrod. Axelrod and Zassulich were extremely worried about it.

In such an atmosphere, the controversy over paragraph 1 of the statutes became particularly sharp. On this question of paragraph 1 of the Party statutes Lenin and Martov disagreed

both politically and organisationally. They had often differed before, but formerly the differences had arisen within the confines of a small circle and had soon been outlived; now the differences made their appearance at a Congress, and everybody who had an axe to grind against *Iskra*, against Plekhanov and Lenin, tried to magnify the disagreement into a big question of principle. Lenin began to be attacked for his article *What to start with and how What is to be done?* and to be accused of being personally ambitious, and so forth. Vladimir Ilyich spoke very severely at the Congress. In his pamphlet *One step forward, two steps back*, he wrote: "I cannot help remembering a conversation of mine at that Congress with one of the 'Centre' delegates. 'What a depressing atmosphere prevails at our Congress,' he complained to me. 'All this fierce fighting, this agitation one against the other, these sharp polemics, this uncomradely attitude!—'What a fine thing our Congress is,' I replied to him. 'Opportunity for open fighting. Opinions expressed. Tendencies revealed. Groups defined. Hands raised. A decision taken. A stage passed through. Forward! That's what I like! That's life! It is something different from the endless wearying intellectual discussions, which finish, not because people have solved the problem, but simply because they have got tired of talking.' The comrade of the 'Centre' looked on me as though perplexed and shrugged his shoulders. We had spoken in different languages."

That quotation sums up Ilyich to a "t."

From the very beginning of the Congress his nerves had been keyed up to the utmost. The Belgian working woman with whom we were lodging in Brussels was very annoyed that Vladimir Ilyich had not eaten the fine radishes and Dutch cheeses she had served up for breakfast, as he was without appetite even by then. In London he got into such a state that he left off sleeping altogether, and was extremely restless.

Nobody expected a split. I remember a conversation with Trotsky. No matter how fiercely Vladimir Ilyich spoke in the discussions, he was utterly impartial as chairman, and never indulged in the slightest injustice towards an opponent. It was quite different with Plekhanov. When chairing, he was very fond of shining with wit and teasing his opponent. After Plekhanov had made some such joke as—"Horses don't talk, but asses are unfortunately doing so now." Trotsky said to me: "Persuade Vladimir

Ilyich to take the chair, or else Plekhanov will bring things to a split."

It was not a question of the chairman, however.

Although on the question of the position of the Bund in the Party, the recognition of the *Iskra* tendency as the "banner," and on the question of the Programme, the majority of delegates did not differ, a definite gulf nevertheless made itself felt by the time Congress was half-way through, and became deeper towards the end. Strictly speaking, serious differences hindering joint work or making it impossible had not yet arisen at the Second Congress. They were still in a concealed form, one might say potentially present. The Congress, however, now clearly began to divide into two camps. Many people considered that the tactlessness of Plekhanov, the "fierceness" and ambition of Lenin, the pinpricks of Pavlovich, and an unjust attitude towards Zassulich and Axelrod were the causes that were to blame for everything. The delegates who were of this opinion supported the "offended," but in only seeing personalities in the matter missed the whole substance of the discussions. Trotsky also did not grasp the substance. The real point was that the comrades grouped around Lenin had a much more serious attitude towards principles, wanted to carry them out at all costs and inculcate them into all the practical work; the other group was of a more superficial make-up, was inclined to compromises, to concessions in principle, and was more concerned with individuals.

The struggle became exceedingly acute during the elections. A couple of scenes just before the voting remain in my memory. Axelrod was reproaching Baumann ("Sorokin") for what seemed to him to be a lack of moral sense, and recalled some unpleasant gossip from exile days. Baumann remained silent, and tears came to his eyes.

Another scene I remember. Deutsch was angrily reprimanding "Glebov" (Noskov) about something. The latter raised his head, and with gleaming eyes said bitterly: "You just keep your mouth shut, you old dodderer!"

The Congress ended. "Glebov," "Clair," and "Kurz" were elected to the Central Committee. Out of forty-four decisive votes there were twenty abstentions. Plekhanov, Lenin, and Martov were elected to the Central organ. Martov refused to join the editorial board. The split had come.



## VII

### AFTER THE SECOND CONGRESS, 1903-1904

In Geneva, whither we returned after the Congress, there started a battle of recriminations. Most voluble of all in Geneva were the *émigrés* belonging to the Russian colonies of other towns. Members of the League of Russian Social Democrats Abroad would arrive and ask: "What *did* happen at the Congress? What was all the quarrelling about? Why did you want to split?"

Plekhanov, who became terribly weary of these inquiries, once related: "NN. came. He kept asking questions and repeating, 'So I am an ass—like Buridanov!' So I asked him, 'Why like Buridanov, in particular.....?'"

People also began to arrive from Russia. Incidentally there arrived from Petersburg the Yerem, in whose name Vladimir Ilyich had addressed his letter to the Petersburg organisation a year previously. He immediately sided with the Mensheviks, and called to see us. On meeting us he assumed a melodramatic attitude and turning to Vladimir Ilyich, cried out: "I am Yerem!" Then he began a tirade about the Mensheviks' being right.....I also remember a member of the Kiev Committee who insisted on finding out what were the "material changes" that determined the split at the Congress. I just stared at him in astonishment. I had never come across such a primitive interpretation of the correlation between the "base" and the "superstructure." I had not even supposed that it could exist.

People who had formerly helped us by donations, or had allowed us to use their apartments for appointments, and the like, withdrew this assistance under the influence of the Mensheviks. I remember an old acquaintance of mine, who, with her mother, was in Geneva on a visit to her sister. In our childhood days we had played such wonderful games at travellers and at savages living in trees that I was overjoyed on hearing of her arrival. Now she was by no means young, and had become quite a different person.

In our conversation, allusion was made to the assistance which their family had always given to the Social Democrats. "We cannot let you have our apartment for appointments any longer," she declared. "We view this split between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks very unfavourably. These personal scandals have a very harmful effect on the cause." But as far as Ilyich and I were concerned, our attitude was—devil take these "sympathisers," who belong to no organisation and who imagine that their provision of accommodation and some cash entitles them to have an influence in the affairs of a proletarian party!

Vladimir Ilyich immediately wrote to Clair and Kurz in Russia about everything that had happened. In Russia they hummed and hawed, but were not able to advise anything useful. For instance, they actually proposed recalling Martov to Russia, hiding him away in some out-of-the-way hole to write popular pamphlets. It was decided to send Kurz abroad.

After the Congress Vladimir Ilyich raised no objection when Glebov proposed co-opting the old members of the editorial—even to drag along in the old way was better than a split. But the Mensheviks refused. In Geneva, Vladimir Ilyich tried to come to terms with Martov. He wrote to Potressov to convince him that there was no real cause for a split. He also wrote about the split to Kalmykova ("Auntie") and told her how matters stood. He still could not believe that there was no way out. To wreck the decisions of a Congress, to jeopardise work in Russia and the working capacity of the newly-formed Party, seemed to Vladimir Ilyich simply madness—something incredible. There were moments when he saw clearly that a rupture was inevitable. Once he began writing to Clair to the effect that the latter did not fully realise what was the real position, that it should be understood that the old relations had radically changed, that the old friendship with Martov was now ended—old friendships must be forgotten and the fight commenced. But that letter was neither finished nor sent by Vladimir Ilyich. It was exceedingly difficult for him to break with Martov. Work together in Petersburg, the period of work on the old *Iskra*, had bound them closely together. In those days Martov, who was extremely impressionable, had shown a keen sense for grasping Ilyich's ideas and developing them in a talented manner. Afterwards, Vladimir Ilyich vehemently fought the Mensheviks, but every time that Martov, even

in the slightest degree, took the correct line, his old attitude towards him revived. Such was the case, for example, in Paris in 1910, when Martov and Vladimir Ilyich worked together on the editorial of *The Social Democrat*. Coming home from the office, Vladimir Ilyich often used to relate in joyful tones that Martov was taking a correct line, or was even opposing Dan. Later, back in Russia, how pleased Vladimir Ilyich was with Martov's position in the July (1917) days; not because it was of any advantage to the Bolsheviks, but because Martov was acting worthily—as behoved a revolutionary.

When Vladimir Ilyich was already seriously ill, he said to me somewhat dolefully, "Martov is dying too, so they say....."

The majority of the delegates to the Congress (the Bolsheviks) returned to Russia to work. All the Mensheviks did not leave. Indeed, they were joined by Dan. Abroad, the number of their supporters grew.

The Bolsheviks remaining in Geneva met periodically. At these meetings Plekhanov took up the same intransigent position, and made fun of everyone.

The Central Committee member, Kurz, alias Vassiliev (Leng-nik), arrived at last. He became overwhelmingly depressed by the atmosphere of mutual reproach prevailing at Geneva. He was snowed under with a whole heap of affairs—investigation of disputes, sending people to Russia, and so forth.

The Mensheviks scored some successes in *émigré* circles and decided to give battle to the Bolsheviks. They convened a congress of the League of Russian Social Democrats Abroad to hear the report of Lenin, who was League delegate to the Second Congress. At that time the League Management Committee included Deutsch, Litvinov, and myself. Deutsch insisted on the holding of a League Congress but Litvinov and I were against, knowing full well that under the conditions obtaining, the Congress would become an absolute scandal. Then Deutsch remembered that the Committee also included Vechesslov, who lived in Berlin, and Leitesen, who resided in Paris. Actually, they had not directly participated in the work of the League Committee for some considerable time, but had not officially resigned. They were asked to vote and they cast in favour of the Congress.

While cycling to the League Congress, Vladimir Ilyich, who had become engrossed in thought, ran into the back of a tram, and

very nearly had his eye knocked out. He appeared at the Congress pale and bandaged. The Mensheviks attacked him with furious hatred. I remember one wild scene, and recall the frenzied faces of Dan, Krokhamal, and others, who were standing up and banging the tops of their desks.

At the Congress of the League, the Mensheviks were numerically stronger than the Bolsheviks. Moreover, there were more "generals" among their number. The Mensheviks adopted a League Statute, that made the League a bulwark of their faction, made it independent of the Central Committee, and gave the Mensheviks the right to issue their own publications. Thereupon Kurz (Vassiliev), on behalf of the C. C., demanded the withdrawal of the Statutes, and as this was not obeyed he declared the League dissolved.

Plekhanov's nerves would not stand the scandal perpetrated by the Mensheviks, and he declared: "I cannot fire at my own side."

At the meeting of the Bolsheviks, Plekhanov stated that we ought to compromise. "There are moments," he said, "when even the Autocracy is compelled to make a compromise." "Then it is said to be wavering," retorted Liža Knuniantz. Plekhanov flashed an angry glance at her.

Plekhanov decided, in order, as he said, to preserve peace in the Party, to co-opt the old *Iskra* editorial. Vladimir Ilyich resigned from the Board, stating that he would give up collaborating and would not even insist on the publication of his resignation from the editorial. Let Plekhanov try to make peace; he would not bar the road to peace in the Party. Just prior to this, Vladimir Ilyich had written a letter to Kalmykova: "There can be no worse a blind alley than to leave work." In quitting the editorial, he was entering such a blind alley, and he understood this. The Opposition further demanded the co-option of representatives on to the C. C.—two seats on the Council—and that the decisions of the League Congress be recognised as valid. It was agreed to co-opt two Opposition representatives on to the C. C., to give them one place on the Council, and gradually to reorganise the League. But peace did not ensue. Plekhanov's compromise emboldened the Opposition. Plekhanov insisted that a second C. C. representative, Rou (alias Konyaga, and whose real name was Galperin), should leave the Council to be replaced by a Menshevik. Vladimir Ilyich for a long time hesitated at this new concession. I

remember how the three of us—Vladimir Ilyich, Konyaga, and I—stood that evening by the edge of the turbulent Geneva Lake. Konyaga persuaded Vladimir Ilyich to agree to his resignation. Finally, Vladimir Ilyich agreed, and went to Plekhanov to tell him that Rou would leave the Council.

Martov issued a pamphlet, *A State of Siege*, which was full of the most wild accusations. Trotsky also wrote a pamphlet, *Report of the Siberial Delegation*, in which events were depicted quite in the spirit of Martov, Plekhanov being represented as a pawn in the hands of Lenin, etc.

Vladimir Ilyich wrote his reply to Martov in the form of a brochure, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, in which he made a detailed analysis of events at the Congress.

At the same time a struggle was also going on in Russia. The Bolshevik delegates made reports on the Congress. The programme adopted at the Congress and the majority of the resolutions were hailed with great satisfaction by the local organisations. To them the position of the Mensheviks seemed all the more clear. Resolutions were passed demanding that the Congress decisions be obeyed. One of our delegates who did particularly hard work at that time was "Little Uncle" (Lydia M. Knippovich), who, as an old revolutionist, was quite unable to understand how such indiscipline towards Congress decisions could be possible. She and other comrades in Russia wrote encouraging letters. One after the other the committees sided with the Bolsheviks.

Clair arrived. He had not imagined the extent of the barrier which had already arisen between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Thinking it was possible to reconcile the two fractions, he went to talk with Plekhanov. He found out, however, that reconciliation was quite out of question, and came away in a depressed mood. Vladimir Ilyich was still more gloomy.

Early in 1904 there arrived in Geneva, Celia Zelikson, "The Baron" (Essen), representative of the Petersburg organisation, and the worker Makar. They were all supporters of the Bolsheviks, and often visited Vladimir Ilyich. They conversed not only on the quarrel with the Mensheviks, but also on work in Russia. "The Baron," who was quite a young fellow then, was exuberant about the Petersburg work. "We are now placing our organisation," he said, "on a collective basis. There are separate groups at work: the group of agitators, group of propagandists, and group of or-

ganisers." Vladimir Ilyich listened attentively, then suddenly asked: "How many people have you in the propagandist group?" "The Baron" looked rather confused and replied: "Well, so far there's only me." "Not very many, is it?" observed Vladimir Ilyich—"and how many in the agitators' group?" Blushing to the roots of his hair, "The Baron" replied, "Only me, so far." Ilyich roared with laughter and "The Baron" also smiled. By a couple of random questions, aimed at the weakest spots, Ilyich was always able to sort out the real facts from the residue of fine schemes and highly coloured reports.

Later on Olminsky (M. S. Alexandrov) arrived. He had also joined the Bolsheviks. Another newcomer was "Zverka" (in Russian, "the wild creature"—TRANS.), who had escaped from far off exile.

"Zverka" (her real name was M. M. Essen), free at last after her dash from exile, was full of joy and energy, with which she infected those around her. There was not a trace of scepticism or indecision about her. She teased anybody who lamented or sighed over the split. The scandals abroad, somehow did not seem to provoke her in the least. At that period we had instituted a kind of weekly "At Home" at Séchéron, to bring the Bolsheviks closer to one another. At these "At homes," however, "serious" talks did not come off. On the contrary, they had the effect of fanning the feelings that had been aroused by the whole of this fracas with the Mensheviks. In this atmosphere it was great fun to hear "Zverka" boldly strike up a comic song about some "Johnny" or other, and the tall bald-headed worker Yegor join in the chorus. He had just been to have a heart-to-heart talk with Plekhanov—and had even donned a starched collar for the occasion. But he returned from Plekhanov disappointed and despondent. "Zverka" consoled him with the words, "Cheer up, Yegor, and let's get on with 'Johnny.' We'll win, anyway." Ilyich brightened up: this almost brazen cheerfulness seemed to disperse his dejected humour.

Bogdanov then appeared on the horizon. At that time Vladimir Ilyich was still little acquainted with his philosophical works, and did not know him at all, personally. It was evident, however, that he was a man capable of occupying a leading position in the Party. His decision to go over to the Bolsheviks was final. He was only on a temporary visit abroad, as he had extensive contacts in Russia.

At last the period of eternal wrangling drew to a close. Ilyich found it most difficult of all to break finally with Plekhanov.

In the spring Ilyich became acquainted with the old "Narodnaya Volya" revolutionist, Natanson, and his wife. Natanson was a great organiser of the old type. He knew crowds of people, had an excellent knowledge of the value of each individual, and understood who was best suited for the various kinds of work. What particularly struck Vladimir Ilyich was that he not only had an excellent knowledge of the personnel in his own Party, but also had a better knowledge of the Social Democrat organisations than many of our own Central Committee members. Natanson had lived in Baku and knew Krassin, Postolovsky, and others. Vladimir Ilyich thought it would be possible to persuade Natanson to become a Social Democrat. He was very near to the social-democratic viewpoint. Someone related, sometime after, how this old revolutionary sobbed when for the first time in his life he witnessed a huge demonstration in Baku. There was one thing on which Vladimir Ilyich could not agree with him: Natanson was not in accord with the position occupied by the Social Democrats at that time in regard to the peasantry. The intimacy with Natanson lasted a fortnight. Natanson was a great friend of Plekhanov's, in fact spoke with him in the second person.\* Somehow or other Vladimir Ilyich got talking with him about our Party affairs and the split with the Mensheviks. Natanson offered to talk with Plekhanov. He returned somewhat distraught: we should have to make concessions.....

The romance with Natanson was broken off. Vladimir Ilyich became angry with himself that he had come to talk of Social Democrat affairs with someone who was a stranger to the Party, and that this person had been a kind of mediator. He was annoyed with himself and annoyed with Natanson.

While at that time the Central Committee in Russia conducted an ambiguous conciliatory policy, the Local Committees were solid in support of the Bolsheviks. It was necessary to summon a new Congress, based on Russia.

In response to the July declaration of the Central Committee, which deprived Vladimir Ilyich of the possibility of defending his

\*i.e., in the familiar form, using "thou" instead of "you." This is only done among relatives, or very close friends.

viewpoint and of communicating with Russia, he resigned from the C. C. The Bolshevik group, numbering twenty-two, passed a resolution on the need for convening the Third Congress.

Vladimir Ilyich and I took our rucksacks and went into the mountains for a month. "Zverka" had begun to accompany us but she soon tired, and exclaimed: "You like going where there's not even a cat to be seen, and I can't exist without people." Indeed, we always selected the wildest paths and got away into the heart of the mountains, far away from human beings. We tramped for a month: each day we never knew where we would be on the morrow; by the evening we were always so tired that we sank into bed and fell asleep instantaneously.

We had very little cash with us, and existed mostly on eggs, cheese and the like, washed down with wine or spring-water. We rarely sat down to a proper dinner. At one little inn, run by a Social Democrat, a worker advised us: "Don't dine with the tourists, but with the coachmen, chauffeurs, and workmen. You will find it twice as cheap and twice as filling." So we took his advice. The small officials, shopkeepers, and such-like, who aspire to become bourgeois, would sooner be prepared to forgo an outing than to sit down at the same table as a servant. This petty-bourgeois snobbery prevails all over Europe. They talk a great deal about democracy there, but to sit down at the same table with one's servant—not at home, mind you, but in a fashionable hotel—is beyond the powers of any petty-bourgeois who wants to get in with "the best people." Vladimir sat down at the table with great gusto, consumed the dinner with a special appetite and lavished praise on the cheap but satisfying meal. Afterwards we donned our rucksacks and went on farther. The bags were heavyish: in Vladimir Ilyich's was a weighty French dictionary, and in mine an equally heavy French book which I had just received for translation. Neither the dictionary nor the book, however, was opened even once during the whole of our journey; instead of the dictionary, we looked at mountain-tops, covered with perpetual snow, at blue lakes and boisterous waterfalls.

After passing the time in this way for a month Vladimir Ilyich's nerves became normal again. It was just as though the mountain streams had washed away all the cobwebs of petty intrigue. We spent August together with the Bogdanovs, Olminsky, and the Pervukhins in an out-of-the-way little village by the side of the Lac



de Bré. With the Bogdanovs we discussed a plan of work. Bogdanov, proposed co-opting Lunacharsky, Stepanov, and Bazarov for literary work. Our plan was to publish our own organ abroad and agitate in Russia for the Congress.

Ilyich got quite happy again, and in the evenings when he returned home from the Bogdanovs, a most frantic barking would commence—it was Ilyich playing with the chained-up dog as he came past.

When we returned to Geneva in the autumn we moved from the outskirts of the town nearer to the centre. Vladimir Ilyich joined the Société de Lecture, where there was a fine library, excellent conditions for work, and where large number of newspapers in the French, German, and English languages were received. It was very convenient to work in the Reference Rooms. The members of the Society were for the most part elderly professors who seldom visited the library. Ilyich therefore had the room to himself.

The employee of the Geneva "Société de Lecture" (Reading Society) could bear witness as to how there arrived early every morning a Russian revolutionist, with trouser-bottoms turned up, Swiss fashion, to avoid the mud, and which he had forgotten to turn down. He would again take out the books left unfinished the day before. They would be about barricade-fighting or the technique of offensives. He would go to his customary place at the little table by the window, smooth down the thin hair on his bald head with a customary gesture, and bury his nose deep in the books. Only rarely would he get up, and then in order to take down a dictionary from a shelf and search for the explanation of some unfamiliar term. He would then stride up and down for a while, resume his seat, and in a tense manner rapidly scrawl something in minute handwriting on little squares of paper.

He could rest assured that no Russian comrade would burst in here and start complaining that the Mensheviks had said such-and-such a thing, or acted nefariously in such-and-such a place. Here one could think without being distracted. And there was plenty to think about.

Russia had commenced the Japanese War, which brought out particularly clearly the whole rottenness of the Tsarist Monarchy. In the Japanese War the defeatists included not only the Bolsheviks but also the Mensheviks, and even Liberals. A wave of popular

indignation surged up from below. The working-class movement entered a new phase. News came more and more frequently about mass public meetings held in defiance of the police, and direct fights between police and workers.

In face of the growing mass revolutionary movement petty fractional squabbles no longer troubled us to the same extent as recently. These disputes, indeed, had at times assumed the nature of a brawl. One occasion, for instance, was when the Bolshevik Vassiliev arrived from the Caucasus, and wished to give a report on the state of affairs in Russia. At the beginning of the meeting the Mensheviks demanded the election of a presidium, although this was just an ordinary report which any Party member could come to hear, and not an organised meeting. The Mensheviks, in trying to turn every report or lecture into a kind of electoral contest, were attempting to silence the Bolsheviks "by democratic means." Matters almost developed into fisticuffs. In the pandemonium someone tore Natalia Bogdanov's cloak (Natalia was Bogdanov's wife), while somebody else got hurt. Now, however, we were not worried so much by this sort of thing as formerly.

Now all thoughts were turned to Russia. A tremendous responsibility was felt in face of the workers' movement developing there in Petersburg, Moscow, Odessa, and other towns.

All Parties—Liberals and Socialist-Revolutionaries included—began to reveal their real substance particularly clearly. The Mensheviks also disclosed their physiognomy. What divided the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks now became quite clear.

Vladimir Ilyich had a most profound faith in the class instinct of the proletariat, in its creative forces, in its historic mission. This faith was not born in Vladimir Ilyich in a day. It became moulded in him during the years when he had studied and meditated Marx's theory of class struggle; when he had studied the actual conditions of Russian life; when, in combating the conceptions of the old revolutionaries, he had learnt to counterpose the heroism of individual militants by the power and heroism of class struggle. It was thus no blind faith in an unknown force, but a profound assurance in the strength of the proletariat, and in its tremendous rôle in the cause of emancipating the toilers. It was an assurance based upon a profound knowledge of the subject, and a most conscientious study of actual conditions. His work among the Petersburg proletariat invested in living forms this faith in the power of

the working class.

At the end of December the Bolshevik newspaper *Vperiod* began to appear. In addition to Ilyich, the editorial included Olminsky and Orlovsky. Soon Lunacharsky arrived to give a hand. His articles and speeches, with their pathos, were in assonance with Bolshevik feelings at that time.

The revolutionary movement in Russia continued to grow, and at the same time correspondence with Russia also increased. It soon grew to three hundred letters a month, which was an enormous figure for those days. And it provided Ilyich with a spate of material! He really knew how to read workers' letters. I remember one letter, written by workers of the Odessa stone-quarries. It was a collective essay, written in several primitive-looking hands, devoid of subjects and predicates, and innocent of stops and commas. But it radiated an inexhaustible energy and readiness to fight to the finish, to fight until victorious. It was a letter in which every word, however naïve, was eloquent of unshakable conviction. I do not remember now what the letter referred to, but I remember what it looked like—the paper and the red ink. Ilyich read that letter over many times, and paced up and down the room deep in thought. It had not been a vain endeavour when the Odessa quarrymen wrote Ilyich their letter: they had written to the right person, to someone who understood them best of all.

A few days after this letter from the quarry workers a letter arrived from Tanyusha—a young Odessa propagandist who was just coming out. She gave a conscientious and detailed description of a meeting of Odessa artisans. Ilyich also read this letter and immediately sat down to reply to Tanyusha: "Thanks for the letter. Write more often. Of great importance to us are letters describing the ordinary *workaday* activities. We get devilish few of such letters."

In practically every letter Ilyich asked the Russian comrades to supply more contacts. "The strength of a revolutionary organisation," he wrote to Gussev, "is in the number of its contacts." He asked Gussev to put the Bolshevik foreign centre in touch with the youth. "There exists amongst us," he wrote, "a kind of idiotic, philistine, Oblomov-like fear of the youth." Ilyich wrote to his old acquaintance of Samara days—Alexei Andreyevich Preobrazhensky, who was then living in the country—and asked him for contacts with peasants. He requested the Petersburg

comrades, when despatching workers' letters to the Centre abroad, not to send extracts or résumés, but the original correspondence. These workers' letters told Ilyich more plainly than anything else that the Revolution was approaching, was growing. We were already on the threshold of Nineteen 'Five.

## VIII

### NINETEEN FIVE IN EMIGRATION

Already, in November 1904, in the pamphlet *The Land Campaign and "Iskra's" Plan*, and then in December, in articles in Nos. 1-3 of *Vperiod*,<sup>19</sup> Ilyich wrote that the moment of open struggle of the masses for freedom was approaching. He plainly felt the proximity of the revolutionary upsurge. But it is one thing to feel it approaching and another to learn that the Revolution has already commenced. Therefore, when the news of January 9th reached Geneva, when tidings arrived as to the concrete form in which the Revolution had commenced, it seemed as though everything around us had changed, exactly as if everything that had happened up till now had receded somewhere into the distant past. The news of the January 9th events<sup>20</sup> reached Geneva the morning after. Vladimir Ilyich and I were on our way to the library and met the Lunacharskys, who were on their way to us. I remember the figure of Lunacharsky's wife, Anne Alexandrovna, who was so excited that she could not speak, but only helplessly wave her muff. We went where all the Bolsheviks who had heard the Petersburg news were instinctively drawn—to the Lepeshinskys' emigrant restaurant. We wanted to be together. The people gathered there hardly spoke a word to one another, they were so excited. With tense faces they sang the Revolutionary Funeral March. Everyone was overwhelmed with the thought that the Revolution had already commenced, that the bonds of faith in the Tsar were broken, that now the time was quite near when "tyranny will fall, and the people will rise up—great, mighty and free....."

We were then experiencing the peculiar life that all the Geneva *émigrés* were then living: from one issue of the local paper *Tribune* to the next.

All Ilyich's thoughts were centred on Russia.

Soon Gapon arrived in Geneva. First he got in touch with the Socialist-Revolutionaries, who tried to picture things as though

Gapon was "their man, and in fact the entire Petersburg workers' movement was their handiwork. They boosted Gapon tremendously, and eulogised him. At that time Gapon was the centre of general attention, and the English *Times* paid him fabulous sums for contributions. A short time after Gapon arrived in Geneva a socialist-revolutionary lady came round to us and informed Vladimir Ilyich that Gapon wished to see him. A rendezvous was arranged in a café on "neutral" ground. Evening came. Ilyich did not light the lamp in his room, but kept pacing up and down.

Gapon was a living part of the Revolution that was sweeping Russia. He was closely bound up with the working masses, who devotedly believed in him, and Ilyich was agitated about this meeting.

A comrade recently asked with consternation: how could Ilyich ever have anything to do with Gapon?

Of course, one could simply have ignored Gapon, reckoning in advance that nothing good will ever come from a priest. That is what Plekhanov did, for instance, receiving Gapon extremely coolly. But Ilyich's strength lay precisely in the fact that for him the Revolution was a live thing, he was capable of discerning its features, grasping all its manifold details, knowing and understanding what the masses wanted. And knowledge of the masses can only be obtained by close contact with them. How could Ilyich pass by Gapon, who stood close to the masses, and had such influence over them!

On returning from his meeting with Gapon, Vladimir Ilyich related his impressions. Gapon was then still wreathed in the spirit of the revolution. In speaking of the Petersburg workers he completely flared up, seethed with indignation and revulsion against the Tsar and his agents. This revulsion was very naïve, but it was all the more direct. It was in assonance with the indignation of the working masses. "Only we'll have to teach him," said Vladimir Ilyich. "I said to him, 'Don't you listen to flattery, little father; study, or that's where you'll find yourself'—and I pointed under the table."

On February 8th, Vladimir Ilyich wrote in No. 7 of *Vperiod*: "We hope George Gapon, who has experienced and felt so profoundly the transition from the opinions of a politically unconscious people to revolutionary views, will succeed in working to obtain

that clarity of revolutionary outlook necessary for a political leader."

But Gapon never came to obtain this clarity. He was the son of a rich Ukrainian peasant, and to the end he maintained contact with his family and with his village. He had a good knowledge of the needs of the peasants, his language was simple and close to the rough working masses; this origin of his, his connection with the countryside, perhaps constitutes one of the secrets of his success; but it would be difficult to meet anyone so thoroughly permeated with a priest's psychology as Gapon. Formerly he had never encountered revolutionary circles, and by his very nature was not a revolutionist, but a sly priest, ready for any compromise. Once he related: "At one time they had doubts in me. Faith in me was shaken. I got quite ill, and went away to the Crimea. At that time an old man was there who, they said, was of holy living. I went to him to get my faith strengthened. I came to the old man; the people were gathered by the stream, and the old man was celebrating mass. He made it appear to them that St. George the Victorious was stepping out of a hole in the stream. Stupidity, of course. But, I thought, that's not the point—the old man has profound belief. After mass I went to the old man to get his blessing. He just took off his vestment and said: 'And we've set up a candle-shop here, trade has been so good.' There's faith for you! Well, I hardly got home alive. I then had a pal, the artist Vereshchagin, and he said, 'Chuck up priesthood!' Well, thought I: in the village my relatives are now respected, my father is head of the village, honoured by everyone, and then they'd all throw it up in his face—'Your son's been unfrocked!' So I didn't give up office."

That tale absolutely typifies Gapon.

He did not know how to learn. He spent considerable time learning to shoot at targets and ride on horseback, but he did not get on well with books. It is true, on the advice of Ilyich, he began to read Plekhanov's works. But he read them more from duty than conviction. Gapon was unable to study from books. But he could not even learn from life. The priest's psychology dimmed his sight. After he returned to Russia he slid into the abyss.

From the very first days of the Revolution the whole perspective immediately became clear to Ilyich. He understood that the movement would now grow like an avalanche, that the revolutionary people would not stop half-way, that they could not be held up,

that the workers were pressing forward to the fight against the autocracy. Would the workers conquer or would they be conquered—this would be seen from the result of the fight. Meanwhile, to win, they must be armed in the best way possible.

Ilyich always had a kind of special instinct—a profound comprehension as to what the working class was experiencing at a given moment.

The Mensheviks, taking their bearings from the Liberal bourgeois, which still wanted shaking up, talked about the necessity of “unloosening” the Revolution. Ilyich already knew that the workers had decided to fight to the finish. And he was with them. He knew that it was no good calling a halt half-way, that this would have so demoralised the working class, so diminished their energy in the fight, would have done such tremendous damage to the cause, that it could not be undertaken, no matter in what form. And history has shown that in the Revolution of 1905 the working class suffered a defeat, but was not vanquished, its capacity for struggle was not broken. This was not understood by those who attacked Lenin for his “one-sidedness,” and who, after the defeat, could think of nothing else to say but “we should not have resorted to arms.” To remain faithful to the workers it was impossible to do otherwise than resort to arms, it was impossible for the vanguard to leave its fighting class in the lurch.

And Ilyich was continuously calling upon the working-class vanguard—the Party—to fight, to organise, and to work for the arming of the masses. He wrote of this in *Vperiod*, and in his letters to Russia.

“January the ninth 1905 disclosed all the gigantic reserve of revolutionary proletarian energy, and at the same time the entire inadequacy of the social-democratic organisation,” wrote Vladimir Ilyich at the beginning of February, in his article *Should we organise the Revolution?* Every line of this article reverberated with the call to turn from words to deeds.

Ilyich not only read through, thoroughly studied, and thought over everything that Marx and Engels had written on revolution and insurrection. He also perused numerous works on the art of warfare, considering the technique and the organisation of the armed insurrection from all standpoints. He was occupied with this work much more than people realised, and his talk about “shock” groups during the civil war and “groups of five and ten”



was not the chatter of a layman, but a well-thought-out proposition.

The Bolsheviks sought out all possible means of sending arms to Russia, but what was undertaken was only a drop in the ocean. A Fighting Committee was formed in Russia (in Petersburg), but it worked slowly. Ilyich wrote to Petersburg: "In an affair of this kind there should be less smooth schemes and discussions and talks about fractions in the Fighting Committee, and its rights. It is frantic energy, and yet more energy, that is required here. I am absolutely horrified that people can go on talking about bombs for more than six months without making a single one. And it is most learned people who are talking. Go to the youth, gentlemen. That is the only means of salvation. Otherwise, by God, you'll be late (I can see this plainly), and you will find yourselves with 'learned' notes, plans, drawings, schemes, and excellent recipes, but without an organisation, without a living enterprise.....For Christ's sake, never mind about all the formalities and schemes, and devil take all your 'functions, rights and privileges.....'"

And the Bolsheviks did do a great deal in the way of preparing the armed insurrection, often displaying tremendous heroism, risking their lives every minute. Preparation of the armed rising was the slogan of the Bolsheviks. Gapon also talked in terms of the armed rising.

Soon after his arrival he put forward the proposal for a fighting agreement of the revolutionary Parties. In No. 7 of *Vperiod* (December 5th, 1905), Vladimir Ilyich gave an estimation of Gapon's proposal and examined in detail the whole question of fighting arrangements.

Gapon undertook the task of supplying the Petersburg workers with arms. Subscriptions of all kinds had come into his hands and he purchased the arms in England. The deal was at last settled. A steamer was found, the *Grafton*, the captain of which agreed to carry the arms and unload them on one of the islands not far from the Russian frontier. Not having any idea how the business of illegal transportation was conducted, Gapon thought the matter was much simpler than it really was. He obtained from us an illegal passport and contacts and went off to Petersburg to organise the affair. Vladimir Ilyich saw, in the whole of this enterprise, words being turned into deeds. The workers needed arms at all costs. Nothing at all, however, came of this enterprise. The *Grafton* ran aground, and in general it turned out to be impossible

to get to the island in question. But even in Petersburg Gapon was unable to do anything. He had to hide in the working-class slums, under a false name. It became extremely difficult to get into contact with people. The addresses of the Social Revolutionists, where arrangements were to have been made about the receipt of the smuggled arms, proved to be mythical. Only the Bolsheviks sent their people to the island. All this produced an impression of stupefaction on Gapon. To live illegally, to go hungry, and remain totally anonymous, was quite different from speaking at crowded meetings without any risk at all. The organising of gun-running could only be done by people of quite a different revolutionary stamp from Gapon, people prepared to make any unadvertised sacrifices.

Another slogan put forward by Ilyich was for the support of the peasants' struggle for land. This support would enable the working class, in their struggle, to rely on the peasantry. Vladimir Ilyich always gave a great deal of attention to the peasant question. The only class he considered to be revolutionary through and through was the proletariat. When the Party Programme was being discussed at the Second Congress, Vladimir Ilyich proposed, and strongly defended, the slogan of returning to the peasants the "pieces" of land that were cut off from them in the reform of 1861.

It seemed to him that in order to attract the peasantry it would be necessary to advocate a concrete demand corresponding as closely as possible with the needs of the peasantry. In exactly the same way as the Social Democrats began their agitation among the workers with the fight for hot-water [for tea—TRANS.], for reduction of working hours, for punctual payment of wages, so the peasantry had to be organised around a concrete slogan.

The events of '05 compelled Ilyich to reconsider this question. Interviews with Gapon, a peasant by origin, who maintained contact with the villages; talks with Matinshenko, a sailor from the *Potemkin*, and with many workers from Russia who were intimately acquainted with what was going on in the countryside, convinced Ilyich that the "piece-of-land" slogan was inadequate, that a much broader slogan must be launched—one for the confiscation of landowners' estates, Crown, and Church lands. It was not in vain that at one time Ilyich burrowed so assiduously in statistical works and laid bare in detail the economic connection between town and

village, between heavy and light industry, between the working class and the peasantry. He saw that the moment had come when this economic bond should serve as the basis for a powerful extension of the political influence of the proletariat over the peasantry.

I remember this incident: Gapon once asked Vladimir Ilyich to listen to a manifesto he had written, and which he began to read out with great pathos. The manifesto was filled with curses on the Tsar. "We do not need a Tsar," ran the manifesto, "let there be one master on earth—God, and you will all be his tenants!" (It was precisely the reduction of land rents that was the main fighting slogan of the peasant movement at that time.) Vladimir Ilyich burst out laughing; the figure of speech had been painfully naïve, yet on the other hand it very clearly indicated how close Gapon was to the masses: himself a peasant, he ignited in the workers, who still retained half their connections with the countryside, a passion for land that had been latent in them from time immemorial.

Vladimir Ilyich's laughter disturbed Gapon. "Perhaps not just like that," he said. "Just tell me, and I'll alter it." Vladimir Ilyich at once became serious. "No," he said, "that would be no use, my entire line of thought is different; write it in your own language, in your own style."

Then another scene: This was after the third Congress, after the revolt on the *Potemkin*. The crew, interned in Rumania, were in a ghastly state of want. At that time Gapon received a great deal of money—for his reminiscences, and also all kinds of subscriptions for the cause of the Revolution—and spent whole days running about purchasing clothing for the *Potemkin* sailors. The sailor Matinshenko, one of the most prominent participators in the *Potemkin* revolt, arrived in Geneva. He immediately got on good terms with Gapon and they became inseparable.

About that time a young fellow came from Moscow (I forget his name). He was a red-faced young man who served in a bookshop and had only recently joined the Social Democrats. He related how and why he had joined the Party, and afterwards commenced a dissertation on why the social-democratic programme was correct, expounding it point by point, with the ardour of the novice. Vladimir Ilyich got so bored that he went out to the library, leaving me to give the young man tea and squeeze out of him as much news as possible. The young chap went on reading

out the Programme. At that moment Gapon and Matinshenko came in. Just as I was about to get tea for them as well, the young man arrived at the paragraph dealing with the restoration of the "pieces of land" to the peasants. After reading this point, he explained that the peasants could not go farther than the fight for this land, whereupon Gapon and Matinshenko became infuriated, and shouted: "*All the land to the people!*" I do not know how far matters would have gone had not Ilyich returned at that moment. Quickly sizing up what the dispute was about he did not join in the discussion, but led Gapon and Matinshenko away into his own room. I tried my best to get rid of the young man from Moscow at the earliest possible moment.

At the December Conference in Tammerfors, Ilyich tabled a motion to drop completely from the programme this point on the peasants' land. In its place a paragraph was inserted on the support to be given to the revolutionary measures of the peasantry, including even confiscation of landowners' estates, and official, Church, monastic and Crown lands.

The German Social Democrat Kautsky, who then enjoyed great popularity, viewed the matter quite differently. He wrote, at that time, in *Neue Zeit*, to the effect that in Russia the urban revolutionary movement should remain neutral on the question of the relations between the peasantry and the landowners.

Kautsky is now one of the most prominent betrayers of the workers' cause, but at that time he was considered to be a revolutionary Social Democrat. When another German Social Democrat, Bernstein, at the end of the 'nineties, raised the standard of revolt against Marxism, tried to prove that Marx's teachings should be revised, that much of them had become out of date, and that the aim (Socialism) was nothing, but the movement everything, Kautsky openly opposed Bernstein and defended Marx's teachings. Then Kautsky's name was surrounded in glamour, as the most revolutionary and consistent pupil of Marx. For this reason Kautsky's assertion troubled and grieved Ilyich, and he even tried to excuse him, saying that it was perhaps true for Western European relations, but that the Russian Revolution could only be victorious with the support of the peasantry.

This opinion of Kautsky's, however, caused Ilyich to check up whether Kautsky was correctly presenting the viewpoint of Marx and Engels. Vladimir Ilyich studied Marx's attitude towards

the agrarian movement in America in 1848, and the attitude of Engels in 1885 towards Henry George. In April, Vladimir Ilyich published his article: *Marx on the American 'Black Partition.'*

He ended this article with the words: "There could hardly be found another country in the world where the peasantry have experienced such suffering, such oppression and ill-treatment, as in Russia. The more severe was their oppression, so much the mightier will their awakening now be, and so much more unbounded will be their revolutionary onslaught. It is the task of the class-conscious revolutionary proletariat to support this onslaught with all their strength, so as to sweep away the old cursed, feudal-autocratic Russia, so as to create a new generation of free and courageous people, to create a new republican country, in which our proletarian struggle for Socialism will extend in full liberty."

The Bolshevik centre in Geneva was situated at the corner of the famous Rue de Carouge ("Karouzhka"), inhabited by Russian *émigrés*, and the River Arne. Here were housed the *Vperiod* editorial, the dispatch office, the Lepeshinsky's Bolshevik restaurant, and the apartments of Bonch-Bruévich, the Lyadovs (Mandelstams), and Ilyins. Orlovsky, Olminsky, and others were constant visitors at Bonch-Bruévich's. Bogdanov, who returned to Russia, came to an agreement with Lunacharsky (who then came to Geneva) to join the editorial board of *Vperiod*. Lunacharsky turned out to be a brilliant orator and did a great deal to assist in strengthening the Bolshevik positions. From then on Vladimir Ilyich became on very good terms with Lunacharsky, became jolly in his presence, and was rather partial towards him even at the time of the difference with the "*Vperiod*-ites." And Anatoly Vassilievich (Lunacharsky) was always particularly keen and witty in Lenin's presence. I remember an occasion—I believe in 1919 or 1920—when Anatoly Vassilievich, who had just returned from the front, was describing his impressions to Vladimir Ilyich, and how the latter's eyes gleamed as he listened to him. Lunacharsky, Vorovsky, Olminsky—these were fine foundations for *Vperiod*. Then there was Vladimir Dmitrievich Bonch-Bruévich, who was in charge of the business side. He permanently beamed, concocted divers grandiose plans, and was always dashing around on printing-press matters.

The Bolsheviks gathered almost every evening in the Café Landold, and over a mug of beer discussed events in Russia, and made plans.....

Many people went away to Russia. Many prepared to return there.

In Russia, agitation was proceeding for the convention of the Third Congress. So much had changed since the time of the Second Congress, so many new questions had arisen out of the daily struggle, that another congress had become an absolute necessity. The majority of Party Committees were in favour of a Congress. A "Bureau of Majority Committees" was set up. The Central Committee [in Russia—TRANS.] had, on the other hand, co-opted many new members, including even Mensheviks and was, on the whole, of a conciliatory disposition,<sup>21</sup> and hindered the summoning of the Third Congress in all kinds of ways. After the raid on the Central Committee, which took place in the Moscow flat of the writer, Leonid Andreyev, the members of the Central Committee remaining at liberty agreed to the convocation of the Congress, which was held in London. At this Congress there was a clear majority for the Bolsheviks, and it was for this reason the Mensheviks did not send their delegates to the Congress, but convened them to a conference in Geneva.

The Central Committee was represented at the Congress by "Sommer" (alias "Mark," "Lumbimov") and "Winter" (Krassin). Mark looked exceedingly gloomy, but Krassin appeared as though nothing at all had happened. The delegates fiercely attacked the Central Committee for its conciliatory position. Mark sat quite silent and looked as black as night. Krassin also kept silent, supporting his chin on his hand, but he looked unperturbed, just as though all these venomous speeches had not concerned him in the slightest way. When his turn came, he made his report in a calm voice, not even retorting to accusations. And it became clear to everyone that nothing more was to be said, that he had had conciliatory inclinations which had now passed and that henceforth he would be in the ranks of the Bolsheviks, and keep with them to the end.

Party members now know the big and responsible work undertaken by Krassin during the 1905 revolution in arming the fighting detachments, directing the supplies of ammunition, and so forth. All this was done secretly, and without noise, but it entailed a tremendous amount of energy. Vladimir Ilyich knew more than anyone else about this work of Krassin's, and since then always greatly valued him.

Four delegates came from the Caucasus: Mikha Tskhakaya, Alesha Djaparidze, Leman, and Kamenev. There were three mandates. Vladimir Ilyich inquired as to which of the four delegates were entitled to the three mandates. Who received the majority of votes? Mikha replied with consternation: "Why, do you think we put things to the vote in the Caucasus? We decide all matters in a comradely way. They sent four of us, and it's not important how many mandates there are." Mikha proved to be the oldest delegate present—even at that time he was fifty. It was he who opened the Congress. The Polessian Committee was represented by Lyova Vladimirov. We had written to him many times in Russia about the split, and did not receive any reply. But in reply to our letters concerning the further antics of the Martovites he wrote to us, describing how many and which leaflets had been distributed, and where strikes and demonstrations had taken place in Polessia. At the Congress Vladimirov showed himself to be a firm Bolshevik.

Other delegates from Russia present at the Congress included Bogdanov, Postolovsky ("Vadim"), P. P. Rumyantsev, Rykov, Sammer, Zemlyachka, Litvinov, Skrypnik, Bur, Shklovsky, and Kramolnikov.

Everything taking place at this Congress produced the feeling that the working-class movement in Russia was reaching fever heat. Resolutions were passed on armed insurrection; on a Provisional Revolutionary Government; on the attitude towards Government tactics on the eve of the Revolution; on the question of open action by the R.S.D.L.P.; on relations with the peasant movement; the attitude towards the Liberals; towards the social-democratic organisations of the subject nations; on propaganda and agitation; on the section of the Party that had split away; and so on.

Besides the question of confiscating the landed estates brought up by Vladimir Ilyich, and to which I referred above, the Third Congress was characterised by two other questions; that of the two leading centres and the question of relations between workers and intellectuals.

At the Second Congress the dominating elements had been the *littérateurs* and practical Party workers, who had performed a great deal of activity for the Party in one form or another, but who were connected by very weak ties with the Russian organisations, which were then only just beginning to be formed.

The Third Congress, however, bore quite a different physiognomy. By this time the organisations in Russia had taken definite shape. They took the form of illegal committees working under drastically difficult conditions of secrecy. Owing to these conditions, the committees hardly anywhere had factory workers among their members, though they had a great deal of influence over the Labour movement. The leaflets and "instructions" of the committees corresponded to the mood of the working masses, and the latter felt they had a leadership; the committees therefore enjoyed great popularity, but for the majority of workers their activity was obscured by the haze of secrecy. The workers frequently met apart from the intellectuals in order to discuss the fundamental problems of the movement. A statement was sent to the Third Congress by fifty Odessa workers on the main questions on which the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks differed. They reported that at the meeting where this matter had been discussed not a single intellectual was present.

The "Komitetchik"<sup>22</sup> was usually a fairly self-assured person, who realised what great influence the work of the committees had over the masses; he generally did not recognise any inner-Party democracy whatever. "This democratism only leads to us falling into the hands of the authorities; we are already quite well enough connected with the movement," the Komitetchiks would say. And inwardly, these committee members always rather despised "the people abroad," who, they considered, just grew fat and organised intrigues. "They ought to be sent to work under 'Russian conditions'" was their verdict. The Komitetchiks did not like to feel the pressure from abroad. At the same time they did not like innovations. They were neither desirous nor capable of adapting themselves to the changing conditions.

In the period 1904-1905 these members of the committees bore tremendous responsibilities on their shoulders, but many of them experienced the utmost difficulty in adapting themselves to the conditions of increasing opportunities for legal work, and to the methods of open struggle. At the Third Congress there were no workers present—or, at any rate, not a single prominent worker. The "Babushkin" present was not the worker of that name, who, at that time, was in Siberia, but, as far as I remember, was the alias used by Comrade Shklovsky. On the other hand there were many committee members. If this make-up of the Congress is not borne



in mind, a great deal of the matter in the reports of this Congress will not be properly understood.

The question of the "bridling" of the foreign centre was not only raised by the Komitetchiks, but also by other prominent Party workers. The opposition to "abroad" was headed by Bogdanov.

There was a good deal of loose talk on this matter, but Vladimir Ilyich did not particularly take it to heart. He considered that, owing to the development of the Revolution, the importance of the foreign centre was declining hourly. He knew that he himself was by no means to be a "permanent resident" abroad, and his main concern was that the central organ be rapidly informed by the Central Committee (in Russia) as to everything happening. (Henceforth the central organ was to be entitled *Proletarii*, but, for the time being, was to continue to be published abroad.) He also insisted that periodical meetings should be arranged between members of the foreign and the Russian sections of the Central Committee.

The question of bringing workers on to the committees was fraught with much greater contention. Vladimir Ilyich vigorously defended the idea of including workers. The people abroad, Bogdanov and the writers, were also in favour. The Komitetchiks were against. Both sides became very heated. The members of the committees insisted that no resolution be passed on the subject; indeed, it would have been impossible to pass a resolution that workers should *not* be brought on to the committees!

In his speech in this discussion Vladimir Ilyich said: "I think we should consider the question more broadly. To bring workers on to the committees is not only an educational but also a political task. The workers have a class instinct, and even with little political experience they quite quickly become steadfast Social Democrats. I would very much like to see eight workers on our committees for every two intellectuals. If our written counsel, that as many workers as possible should be brought on to the committees, proves inadequate, it would be as well to issue this advice in the name of the Congress. If you get a clear and definite instruction from the Congress, you will have a radical means of fighting demagoguery: it will be the express will of the Congress."

Even before this occasion, Vladimir Ilyich had firmly championed the necessity of bringing the largest possible number of

workers on to the committees. He already wrote about this in 1903 in his *Letter to a Petersburg Comrade*. Now, in defending this standpoint at the Congress, he became very heated, and even made interruptions. When Mikhailov (Postolovsky) said: "So in practical work very small demands are made of intellectuals, but extremely big demands are made of workers," Vladimir Ilyich cried out: "That is absolutely true!" His exclamation was drowned in a chorus of—"Not true!" from the Komitetchiks. When Rumyantsev said: "There is only one worker on the Petersburg committee, although work has been going on there for fifteen years," Vladimir Ilyich shouted: "What a disgrace!"

Afterwards, when the debates had ended, Ilyich said: "I could not sit still and listen to them saying that there were no workers suitable to be members of committees. The question drags on, and it shows there is a malady in the Party. Workers must be brought on to the committees." If Ilyich was not very much concerned that his viewpoint met with such a rebuff at the Congress, it was simply because he knew that the approaching Revolution would itself radically cure the Party of this incapacity to make the committees working class in composition.

Another big question before the Congress was that of propaganda and agitation.

I remember how a young girl from Odessa came to see us at Geneva, and complained: "The workers are making impossible demands of the committee: they want us to supply them with propaganda. As if that is possible. We can only give them agitation!"

The story of this Odessa girl made quite an impression on Ilyich. It led to a big discussion on the question of propaganda. As Zemlyachka, Mikha Tskhakaya, and Dessnitsky said in their speeches, the old forms of propaganda had proved to be defunct, propaganda had become transformed into agitation. With the colossal growth of the Labour movement verbal propaganda and even agitation in general could not satisfy the demands of the movement: what was wanted was popular literature, a popular newspaper, literature for the peasants, for the nationalities speaking different languages.....

Day-to-day experience threw up a hundred and one new questions which could not be decided within the limitations of the old illegal organisation. They could only be dealt with by means

of establishing a daily newspaper in Russia, by means of extensive legal publishing activity. However, freedom of the Press had not yet been won. It was decided to publish an illegal paper in Russia, to form there a group of journalists whose duty it would be to attend to the production of popular literature. It was obvious, however, that all these things were but palliatives.

Much discussion at the Congress was devoted to the revolutionary struggle that was in process. Resolutions were passed on the events in Poland and the Caucasus. "The movement is growing broader and broader," said the delegate from the Urals. "It is quite time we left off regarding the Urals as a backward, sleepy borderland, incapable of moving. The political strike at Lyssva, big strikes in various factories, the large variety of revolutionary symptoms which even go as far as an agrarian-industrial terror, in the most varied forms of small spontaneous demonstrations—all these things show that the Ural region is on the eve of a big revolutionary movement. It is highly probable that this movement in the Urals marks the transition to an armed insurrection. It was the first place where the workers used bombs and even employed artillery (at the Votinsky Works). Comrades, don't forget the Urals!"

Vladimir Ilyich, naturally, talked for a long while with the Ural delegate.

Generally speaking, the Third Congress correctly formulated the line of struggle. The Mensheviks decided the same questions in quite a different manner. Vladimir Ilyich elucidated the differences in principle between the resolutions of the Third Congress and those of the Menshevik Conference in his pamphlet *The Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*.

We returned to Geneva. I was elected to the Commission appointed to edit the reports of the Congress, together with Kamsky and Orlovsky. Kamsky had to leave, and Orlovsky was very busy with other work. The verification of the minutes was organised at Geneva, where quite a large number of delegates came after the Congress. In those days there were no shorthand-typists nor special secretaries, and the minutes were taken down in turn by two members of the Congress, and afterwards handed to me. Not all Congress delegates were good secretaries, and, it goes without saying, there was no time to read over the reports during the Congress. Therefore the checking of the reports together

with the delegates was undertaken in Geneva, at the Lepeshinskys' Café. Naturally, every delegate found that what he had expressed had not been correctly recorded, and wanted to make insertions. This was not allowed, however, and amendments could only be accepted when the other delegates agreed to the validity of such alterations. This work was very difficult, and did not proceed without some friction. Skrypnik ("Shtchensky") wanted to take the minutes home with him, and when it was pointed out to him that in that case they would have to be handed out to everybody, which would entail an absolute scramble for the reports, Skrypnik became angry, and sent a protest to the Central Committee about it—written in block capitals. When the rough work was finished a considerable time was also spent at Orlovsky's, editing the reports.

In July we received the first minutes of the meeting of the newly elected Central Committee. It was reported that the Mensheviks in Russia were not in agreement with *Iskra*, and would also conduct a boycott, that the Central Committee had discussed the question of supporting the peasant movement, but had not yet done anything as they wanted to consult the agronomists.

The letter seemed terribly skimpy. The following letter on the work of the Central Committee was still more meagre. Ilyich became very nervy. After having breathed the Russian atmosphere of the Congress, it was all the more difficult to tolerate being cut off from Russian work.

In his letter to the Central Committee in mid-August, Ilyich urged them to "cease being dumb," and not to be content with discussing things among themselves. "The Central Committee seems to have some internal defect," he wrote to the members of the Central Committee in Russia.

In subsequent letters he severely chided them for not carrying out the instruction to keep the central organ regularly informed.

In the September letter, addressed to "Augustus," Ilyich wrote: "To wait until you get complete agreement with the Central Committee, or among its agents, is sheer Utopia. We don't want a coterie, but a Party, dear friend?" In the same letter, replying to an indignant complaint that our people had been printing Trotsky's leaflets, Ilyich wrote: "... they are printing Trotsky's leaflets.....dear me..... there's nothing wrong in that, provided the leaflets are tolerable, and have been corrected,"

In a letter to Gushev on October 13th, 1905, he pointed to the necessity of carrying on a trade-union campaign side by side with the preparations for an armed rising. This struggle, however, should be conducted in a Bolshevist spirit, and in opposition to the Mensheviks.

---

Forerunners of the freedom of the Press appeared on the Geneva horizon. Publishers began to make their appearance, and one after the other offer to publish legally pamphlets that were issued illegally abroad. The Odessa "Burevestnik," the "Malych" Publishing House, and others, all offered their services. The Central Committee requested us to abstain from concluding any contracts as it was proposed to establish their own publishing machinery.

At the beginning of October, it was suggested that Ilyich should go to Finland, where, it was proposed, a meeting should be held with the Central Committee. But the events that transpired led to a reconsideration of the question—and Vladimir Ilyich got ready to return to Russia. I was to remain in Geneva a couple of weeks longer in order to clear up. I helped Ilyich to sort out all his papers and letters and arrange them in envelopes. Ilyich himself noted down the contents on each envelope. Everything was packed in a trunk and given into the safe keeping of, I believe, Comrade Karpinsky. This trunk was preserved, and presented to the Lenin Institute after Ilyich's death. It contained a huge quantity of documents and letters which throw a striking light on the Party history of that period.

In September Ilyich wrote to the Central Committee:

"As to Plekhanov, I am letting you know the local rumours, for your information. He has got very angry with us for exposing him before the International Bureau. In No. 2 of the *Diary of a Social Democrat*, he curses like a trooper. Some talk about a paper of his own, and others about his return to *Iskra*. Our conclusion: we should increasingly mistrust him."

And on October 8th Vladimir Ilyich continued: "I earnestly request that you now give up all thought of Plekhanov and appoint our own delegate from the Bolsheviks. It would be all right to appoint Orlovsky."

When, however, news came that there was a possibility of establishing a daily paper in Russia, and when Ilyich was already

preparing to return, he wrote Plekhanov a cordial letter, appealing to him to collaborate in the paper. "Our Revolution will itself efface tactical differences with astonishing rapidity. A basis is being created upon which it will be ever so easy to forget the past, and to work in harmony for a live cause....." In concluding Ilyich asked for an interview with Plekhanov. I do not remember whether it took place. Probably not, as I would hardly have forgotten such an episode.

Plekhanov did not return to Russia in 1905.

In his letter, dated October 26th, Ilyich already gave a detailed account of his return. "Our Russian Revolution is going on fine," he wrote. "By jove, it is!" In reply to a question as to when the insurrection was timed for, he wrote: "*I would delay the rising till the spring. But we shan't be asked. anyway.*"

## IX

### NINETEEN FIVE IN PETERSBURG

It had been arranged that in Stockholm Vladimir Ilyich should be met by a man who would provide him with documents under another name, with which he could cross the frontier and take up residence in Petersburg. Days passed by, however, and the man did not arrive; and Ilyich had to wait by the sea for the weather to change. Meanwhile, in Russia the revolutionary events were assuming ever broader dimensions. He waited two weeks in Stockholm and arrived in Russia at the beginning of November. I followed him ten days later, having first settled all affairs in Geneva. A police-spy fastened himself on to me, getting on the steamer with me at Stockholm and afterwards on the train that went from Hango to Helsingfors. In Finland the Revolution was already in full swing. I had wanted to send a wire to Petersburg, but a jolly, smiling Finnish girl replied that she could not accept telegrams: there was a post and telegraph strike. In the railway carriages everybody was talking loudly. I got into conversation with a Finnish Party-worker, who for some reason was speaking in German. He was describing the successes of the Revolution. "Spies," he said, "why, we've arrested 'em all and shoved 'em in gaol." My glance fell on the spy who was accompanying me. "But new ones can arrive," I said, beginning to laugh, and looking expressively at my 'tec. The Finn grasped the situation. "Oh", he cried, "you only have to say the word if you notice anybody, and we'll immediately arrest him," We came to some little wayside station. My spy got out at this station—where the train stopped one minute. I did not see him any more.....

I had been living abroad for nearly four years and was pining to death for Petersburg. The whole city was seething, as I knew, and the silence of the Finland station, where I left the train, was in such contrast with my ideas about Petersburg and the Revolution that it first seemed to me that I had got down from the

train at Pargolovo instead of St. Petersburg.

In confusion I turned to a cabby who was standing there, and asked; "What is this station?"\* The cabby actually stepped back a few paces, looked at me sarcastically with arms akimbo, and replied: "It is not a station, but the city of Saint Petersburg."

Outside the terminus I was met by Peter Petrovitch Rummyantsiev. He said that Vladimir Ilyich was staying with them and I went with him somewhere in the Peski direction.

I had first seen Peter Petrovitch Rummyantsiev at Shelgunov's funeral. He had then been a young chap with curly hair, and walked in front of the demonstration, singing. In 1896 I met him in Poltava, just after he had come out of prison, pale and nervy. He was the leader of the Poltava Social-Democrats. He showed outstanding talent, had great influence, and seemed a fine comrade. Later he was imprisoned in The Crosses, and issued instructions from prison.

In 1900 I saw him at Ufa, where he arrived from Samara, and seemed to have a disappointed gloomy look about him.

In 1905 he once more appeared on the scene. By now he was a *littérateur*, a man who had position and a "corporation," a man of bon-vivant habits, but a clever and effective speaker. He carried through the campaign for the boycott of the Shidlovsky Commission<sup>25</sup> excellently, acting like a firm Bolshevik. Soon after the Third Congress, he was co-opted on to the Central Committee.

He had a nice, well-furnished family apartment, and at first Ilyich lived there without registering.

Vladimir Ilyich was always extremely embarrassed when living in other people's quarters. It hindered his capacity for work. When I arrived, he hastened to find some place where we could be together, and we moved into some furnished rooms on the Nevsky—also without registering. I remember talking with the girls who were in service there. They kept telling me about what was happening in Petersburg, supplying a mass of live and striking details. I of course immediately re-told everything to Ilyich. He spoke flatteringly of my capacity for investigation, and from that moment I became his zealous reporter. Usually, when we were living in Russia, I could move about much more freely than Vladimir Ilyich, and speak with a much larger number of people.

\*In Russian, "station" denotes stations other than termini.—TRANS.



By the two or three questions he would put I already understood what he wanted to know, and looked into everything. Even now I have not outlived this habit of mentally formulating my impressions for Ilyich.

On the very next day there was a fairly rich harvest for me in this respect. I went to look for quarters for ourselves, and in Troitsky Street, while looking over an empty apartment, talked with the caretaker. He talked to me for a long while about the countryside, the landowners, and of the need to transfer the land from the lords to the peasants.

By that time we had decided to take up residence legally. Maria Ilyinichna fixed us up somewhere on Grechesky Prospekt with friends. No sooner had we registered when quite a swarm of police-spies surrounded the house. Our terrified host did not sleep the whole night, and walked about with a revolver in his pocket, having decided he would meet the police with arms in hand. "Oh, devil take him," said Ilyich. "His imprudence will get us into an unnecessary scrape." So we went to live illegally again, and apart from each other. I was given the passport of some Prascovia Eugenevna Onegina, with which I lived all the time. Vladimir Ilyich changed his passport several times.

When Vladimir Ilyich arrived in Russia, the legal daily newspaper, *Noraya Zhizn* ("New Life") was already appearing. The publisher was Maria Fedorovna Andreyeva (Gorky's wife); the editor was the poet Minsky; while the contributors included Gorky, Leonid Andreyev, Chirikov, Balmont, and Teffi. The Bolshevik collaborators on the paper were Bogdanov, Rumyantsiev, Rozhkov, Goldenberg, Orlovsky, Lunacharsky, Bazarov, Kamenev, and others. The secretary of *Volna* and all subsequent Bolshevik newspapers of that period was Dmitri Ilyich Leshchenko. He also acted as news editor, and reporter of the Duma sessions, saw the paper off to press, etc. The first article by Vladimir Ilyich appeared on November 10th. It began with the words: "The conditions of activity of our Party have radically changed. Freedom of assembly, trade unions, and the Press has been won." And Ilyich hastened to utilise these new conditions in order at once to sketch in bold strokes the main features of the "new line." The conspiratorial apparatus of the Party was to be preserved. But it was absolutely essential, side by side with the illegal apparatus, to create more and more open and semi-legal Party organisations (as well

as auxiliary organisations to the Party). It was necessary to bring large numbers of workers into the Party. The working class was instinctively, spontaneously Socialist, but more than ten years' work of Social Democracy had still done very little in the way of turning this spontaneity into consciousness. "At the Third Congress," wrote Vladimir Ilyich in a note to the above-mentioned article, "I expressed the desire that Party committees should include about eight workers to every two intellectuals. How out of date that wish has now become! Now we must wish that in the new Party organisation, for every member of the Social Democratic intelligentsia, there are several hundred Social Democrat workers." Appealing to the "Komitetchiks," who feared the Party would become dissolved in the mass, Vladimir Ilyich wrote: "Do not build yourselves imaginary terrors, comrades!" The Social Democrat intelligentsia now had to turn "to the people." "The initiative of the workers themselves will now be displayed to a degree that we, the conspirators and 'Kruzhkovniks' (literally, 'circleites'—TRANS.), of yesterday dared not even dream of." Our task now was not so much to think out formulæ for organising on a new basis, as to develop our activities in a most extensive and audacious manner.

To place the Party Organisation on a new basis another Congress was necessary.

Such was the gist of Ilyich's first "legal" article. (*On the Re-organisation of the Party. Complete Works. Vol. VIII, pp. 373-81. Russian Edition.*)

The old "circle" methods of work were apparent in everything, and they had to be combated.

During the first days of my arrival I naturally went out by the Nevsky Gate to the old Smolensky Sunday-evening classes. No longer were "geography" and natural history taught there now. Propagandist work was now conducted in classes crammed full of working men and women. Party propagandists read lectures. I remember one of these. A young speaker was dealing with Engel's theme, *The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science*.

The workers sat there without winking an eyelid, trying hard to take in what the orator expounded. Nobody asked any questions. Downstairs our Party girls were arranging a club for the workers, unpacking glasses they had brought from town.

When I told Ilyich my impressions of the class, he was pensively silent. What he wanted was something different: activity of

the workers themselves. It was not that such activity did not take place. But it was not prominent at Party meetings. The current of Party work and that of the self-activity of the workers somehow did not seem to converge.

During those years the workers had developed tremendously. I felt this particularly every time I met my former Sunday-school "pupils." Once I was hailed in the street by a baker who turned out to be my former pupil, "Socialist Bakin." Ten years ago he had been deported under escort to his native village for having naïvely argued with the manager of Maxwell's factory, that in changing over from two mules to three, "intensity of labour" would increase. Now he was a fully conscious Social-Democrat, and we talked for a long while about the Revolution that was developing, and the organisation of the working masses. He told me all about the bakers' strike.

That first article of Ilyich's, where he had written openly about the Party Congress and the Party conspiratorial apparatus, turned the *Novaya Zbirn* into an openly Party organ. It was obviously inconceivable that the Minskys, Balmonts, and the like, could remain on the paper. A re-shuffle took place, and the paper was taken over completely by the Bolsheviks. It also became a Party paper from the organisational point of view, working under the control and guidance of the Party.

Ilyich's next article in *Novaya Zbirn* was devoted to the fundamental problem of the Russian Revolution, the mutual relations between the Proletariat and the Peasantry. Not only did the Mensheviks wrongly interpret these relations, but even among the Bolsheviks certain comrades suffered from the "plot-of-land deviation." These comrades turned the question of the peasant's fragment of land into an end in itself, instead of being merely a starting-point for agitation. They continued to maintain the slogan for the peasant's piece of land, even after the experience of actual life had made it possible and necessary to agitate and fight on quite a different basis.

*The Proletariat and the Peasantry* was an instructional article, providing a clear Party slogan: The proletariat of Russia, together with the peasantry, is fighting for the land and freedom; together with the international proletariat and agricultural workers it is fighting for Socialism.

The Bolshevik representatives also began to operate this

standpoint in the Soviet (Council) of Workers' Deputies. This Soviet had come into being on October 13th, when Vladimir Ilyich was still abroad. It arose as the fighting organ of the struggling proletariat. I do not remember Vladimir Ilyich speaking in the Soviet of Workers' Deputies.\* I remember one meeting in the Free Economics Society where a large number of Party people had gathered, as Vladimir Ilyich was expected to speak. He gave a lecture on the agrarian problem. It was there that he first met Alexinsky. But nearly everything connected with that meeting has faded from my memory. I have a vague recollection of some grey door and Vladimir Ilyich pressing towards it through the crowd, in order to get out. I only remember that this meeting was in November, and that Vladimir Ivanovich Nevsky was there.

The fact that the Soviets of Workers' Deputies were the fighting organisations of the people in revolt was noted at once by Vladimir Ilyich in his November articles. He then put forward the conception that a provisional revolutionary government could only be forged in the furnace of revolutionary struggle on the one hand, and, on the other hand, that the Social Democratic Party should strive in every possible way to safeguard its own influence in the Soviets of Workers' Deputies.

Conditions of conspiracy compelled me to live apart from Ilyich. He worked days on end on the Editorial Board, which met not only at the *Novaya Zbiżn* offices, but also in a secret apartment, and at D. I. Leshchenko's place in Glazovsky Street. For reasons of secrecy, however, it was not convenient for me to go there. We therefore met most often at the *Novaya Zbiżn* offices. Here, however, Vladimir Ilyich was always very busy. It was only when, securing a very good passport, he took up residence at the corner of Basseynaya and Nadezhdinskaya that I could call and see him at home. I had to enter through the kitchen and speak in undertones, but we were nevertheless able to discuss everything.

From there he went to Moscow. Immediately on his arrival I went to call on him. I was astounded by the number of spies peering round every corner. "Why have they started such a trail

\*Vladimir Ilyich spoke at the seventeenth session of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies on November 26th (old style 13th), on the question of the lockout declared by the capitalists in reply to the introduction by the workers of the eight-hour day in factories and works. The resolution proposed by V.I. was adopted next day at the meeting of the Soviet. (Cf. *Works*, 2nd Russ. ed., Vol. VIII, p. 553.)

on you?" I asked Vladimir Ilyich. He had not yet left the house since his arrival, and was unaware of this. I began to unpack his trunk and unexpectedly discovered a pair of big, round, blue spectacles. "What on earth are these?" It appears that the Moscow comrades had put these spectacles on Vladimir Ilyich as a "disguise," provided him with a yellow Finnish box, and put him on a non-stop train at the last minute. The result was that a host of detectives simply hurled themselves after him, evidently taking him for a burglar. Our job now was to get out as soon as possible. We emerged arm-in-arm, which was a thing we never usually did, walked in the opposite direction to that we needed, took three cabs one after the other, traversed some through-courtyards, and arrived at Rumyantsiev's, having shaken off our followers. We stayed the night, I believe, with the Wittmeyers, old friends of mine. We called an *izvoschik* and drove by the house where Vladimir Ilyich had been living. The spies were still standing outside the house. Ilyich did not return to that apartment. A couple of weeks later we sent a girl to fetch his things away and settle up with the landlady.

At that time I was secretary of the Central Committee and immediately plunged headlong into this work. The other secretary was Mikhail Sergeyevich Weinstein. My assistant was Vera Rudolfovna Menzhinskaya. That was our secretariat. Mikhail Sergeyevich was engaged more on the military organisation, and was always busy carrying out the instructions of Nikitin (L. B. Krassin). I was in charge of appointments and communication with committees and individuals. It would be difficult to picture now what a simplified technique the C.C. secretariat made shift with. I remember that we never attended C.C. meetings, no one was "in charge" of us, no minutes were taken, ciphered addresses were kept in match-boxes, inside book-bindings, and in similar places.

We had to trust to our memories. A whole heap of people besieged us, and we had to look after them in every way, supplying them with whatever they wanted: literature, passports, instructions, advice. It is now difficult to imagine how we ever managed to cope with it all, and how we kept things in order, being controlled by nobody, and living "of our own free will." Usually on meeting Ilyich I told him in detail about everything. The most interesting comrades on the most interesting business we sent straight to the Central Committee members.

The encounter with the Government drew nearer. Ilyich wrote openly in *Novaya Zbiza* that the army cannot, and should not, be neutral; he wrote about nation-wide arming of the people. On November 26th Khrustalev-Nossar was arrested. Trotsky took over the leadership of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. On December 2nd the Soviet issued a manifesto calling for the non-payment of Government dues. On December 3rd, for having printed this manifesto, eight newspapers were closed down, including the *Novaya Zbiza*. When on December 3rd I went as usual to keep "an appointment" at the Editorial Office, laden with all kinds of illegal literature and documents, a news vendor stopped me at the entrance. He shouted loudly *Novoe Vremya* (the name of a reactionary newspaper—TRANS.). Meanwhile, between the cries, he warned me, *sotto voce*: "A search is going on at the office!" When I told Vladimir Ilyich of this incident, he observed, "The people are behind us."

At the beginning of December there took place the Tammerfors Conference.\* What a pity the minutes of this Conference were not preserved! How enthusiastic everyone was! The Revolution was reaching its zenith and every comrade was seized with the utmost enthusiasm, all were ready for a fight. In the intervals we learnt to shoot. One evening we attended a Finnish mass meeting which was held beneath lighted torches, and the triumphant character of this meeting entirely corresponded with the mood of the delegates. It is hardly likely that any of the delegates to that conference could ever forget it. Among those present were Lozovsky, Baransky, and Yaroslavsky. I remember those comrades because their reports from the localities had been so enthrallingly interesting.

At the Tammerfors Conference, which was attended only by Bolsheviks, a resolution was passed on the necessity for the immediate preparation and organisation of the armed insurrection.

This insurrection was already in full swing in Moscow, and for that reason the Conference was of very short duration. Unless my memory deceives me, we returned on the very eve of the despatch of the Semenov Regiment to Moscow. At any rate, one incident remains in my memory: Not far from the Trinity

\*The Party Conference at Tammerfors was held from December 24th to 30th, 1905 (11th to 17th, old style).

Church a soldier of the Semenov Regiment was walking along with a dismal look on his face. By his side walked a young worker, cap grasped in hand, and heatedly persuading the soldier, entreating him about something or other. The faces were so expressive that it was clear what the worker was asking the soldier—not to take action against the workers, and it was also clear that the Semenov man would not agree to this.

The C.C. called upon the Petersburg proletariat to support the rebel Moscow workers, but concerted action was not achieved. For example, such a comparatively raw district as the Moskovsky acted, while such an advanced district as the Nevsky did not do anything. I remember how Stanislav Volsky, who had been agitating in that very district, raged and cursed about this. He immediately became extremely downcast and almost went as far as to doubt the revolutionary capacity of the workers. He had not taken into consideration how fatigued the Petersburg workers were from the preceding series of strikes, and, what was most important, that they felt how badly they were organised for a decisive fight with Tsardom, how poorly they were armed. And they already saw from the Moscow events that it was a question of a life-and-death struggle.

## X

### PETERSBURG AND FINLAND, 1906-1907

The December rising was crushed, the Government taking harsh reprisals against the rebels.

In his article dated January 1st, 1906 (*The Working Class and its Tasks in the Present Situation*), Vladimir Ilyich estimated the situation existing thus: "Civil war is seething. The political strike, as such, is beginning to exhaust itself, is receding into the past as an obsolete form of movement. In Petersburg, for example, the exhausted and devitalised workers proved not to be in a position to carry through the December strike. On the other hand, the movement as a whole, though suppressed at the moment by the reaction, has undoubtedly been raised to a much higher stage....." "Dubassov's guns have revolutionised new masses of the people to an unprecedented degree....." "What now? We will look reality straight in the face. We are now confronted with the new work of assimilating and refashioning the experience of the latest forms of struggle, also the work of preparing forces in *the most important centres of the movement.*" (My italics.—N.K.) The Moscow defeat was a very bitter experience for Ilyich. It was obvious that the workers had been badly armed, that the organisation had been weak, that even the link between Petersburg and Moscow had been poor. I remember how Ilyich listened to a story told by his eldest sister, Anna Ilyinichna. At the Moscow terminus she had been met by a working woman who bitterly upbraided the Petersburgers: "Thanks, Petersburgers, for your support: for sending the Semenov Regiment."

And as though in answer to this reproach, Ilyich wrote: "It would be extremely advantageous to the Government to suppress, as before, the unconcerted actions of the proletarians. The Government would like immediately to challenge the workers to a fight in Petersburg also, under conditions most disadvantageous to them. But the workers will not yield to this provocation, and



will be able to keep to their course of independent preparation for the next all-Russian action."

Ilyich thought that in the Spring of 1906 the peasantry would also rise, and that this would have its effect on the troops. In his words: "We must more definitely, practically, get down to the tremendous tasks of a new active movement, preparing for it more tenaciously, more systematically, more persistently; *sparing in the greatest degree possible the forces of the proletariat, worn out by the strike struggle.*" (My italics.—N.K.)

"Let the workers' Party get quite clear as to its tasks. Away with constitutional illusions. *We must collect the new forces that are rallying around the proletariat.* (My italics.—N.K.) We must reap the experiences of the two great months of Revolution (November and December). We must once more adapt ourselves to the conditions of the re-established autocracy, must wherever necessary go underground again."

And underground we had to go. The network of the secret organisation was woven anew. From all corners of Russia came comrades with whom we conferred about the work and the policy to be conducted. At first people came to an appointed place where either I, along with Vera Rudolfovna or Mikhail Sergeyevich, received the comrades. For the most intimate and valuable people I arranged interviews with Ilyich, or if on military business, Mikhail Sergeyevich arranged an interview with Nikitin (Krassin). Appointments were arranged in various places: sometimes at Dora Dvoires' dental surgery (somewhere on the Nevsky); sometimes at the dentist Lavrentieva's (on the Nikolayevskaya); at the *Vperiod* bookshop, or at the places of various sympathisers.

I remember two episodes. Once Vera Rudolfovna Menzhinskaya and I arranged to receive newly arriving comrades in the *Vperiod* bookshop, where a special room was set aside for this purpose. A district committee worker, or someone like that, came in with a pile of proclamations, while another sat awaiting his turn. Suddenly the door opened, a police inspector poked his head in, said: "Aha!" and locked us all in. What could we do? It was no good climbing through the window, so we sat there looking helplessly at one another. Then we decided that in the meantime we would burn the proclamations and any other illegal material, which we did. Then we agreed we should tell them we had come to collect popular literature for the villages. And that is what they

were told. The inspector looked mockingly at us, but did not arrest us. He took our names and addresses. Both the names and addresses given were of course fictitious.

On another occasion I only just missed being run in, when I went for the first time to an appointment at Lavrentieva's. Instead of No. 32 they had told me 33. I went up to the door and was surprised to see that the name-card had been pulled off. This is a curious kind of conspiratorial work, thought I ..... The door was opened by some officer's servant and I, without asking anything and loaded with all kinds of ciphered addresses and literature, sailed headlong up the corridor. On my track, ghastly pale and trembling all over, pounced the batman. I stopped: "Isn't there any consultation to-day? I've got frightful toothache?" The batman stammered in reply: "The Colonel is not at home." "What Colonel?" "Colonel Riman." It appears I had stumbled into the flat of Riman, Colonel of the Semenov Regiment which had quelled the Moscow rising and undertaken the punitive reprisals on the Moscow-Kazan Railway.

He evidently feared an attempt on the Colonel's life, which accounted for the card being torn from the door. And I had burst into his quarters and even rushed up the corridor without leave.

"Then I've come to the wrong place, I want the dentist," I said, retracing my steps.

Ilyich spent very restless nights, which greatly fatigued him. He was in general extremely embarrassed. The polite attentiveness of our kind hosts worried him. He liked to work in a library or at home, but here he had repeatedly to adapt himself to the new surroundings.

I used to meet him in the Vienna Restaurant. But as it was not very convenient to talk there in the presence of other people, after sitting there a while or meeting at an agreed spot in the street, we would take a cab to a hotel. We generally went to the one opposite the Nikolayev Station, engaged a private room, and ordered supper. I remember once seeing Yuzef (Dzerzhinsky) in the street. We stopped the *izvostchik* and invited him to join us. He sat upon the driver's box. Ilyich was anxious as to whether he was comfortable; but he laughed and told us he was brought up in the country, and could even travel on the driving-seat of a sleigh.

At last Ilyich became tired of this restless life, and we went to

live together on the Pantaleymonovskaya (in a house opposite the church), where the landlady was inclined towards the Black Hundreds.

Of Ilyich's speeches during that period, I remember a meeting of propagandists from various districts at the Knippovitch's place. Ilyich spoke on rural questions. I remember one Nikolai from the outer Nevsky district asking him some question. At the time I did not at all like Nikolai's trite way of putting the question, nor his manner of speaking. After the meeting, I asked "Little Uncle," who was organiser in the Nevsky Gate district, what kind of a worker Nikolai was. She spoke of him as a clever fellow, with good contacts in the villages, but complained that he was not capable of systematic mass work, but only of creating a considerable stir with a small group of workers. In 1906, Nikolai was nevertheless an active Party worker. During the years of reaction he turned *provocateur*, but, unable to keep it up, he committed suicide. Nikolai belonged to a category of comrades who tried to penetrate among all possible sections of the poor population. I remember his going to a doss-house to carry on agitation. Comrade Krylenko, who at that time was quite a young and pugnacious chap, got into some meeting of Baptists who very nearly gave him a drubbing. Sergei Voitinsky was also continually getting into all kinds of scrapes.

They began a close watch on Ilyich. He had once been to a meeting (I believe at the lawyer Cherekul-Kush's) where he had given a report. They were so hot on his tracks that he decided not to return home. So there sat I, at the window, all night long, and when morning came I concluded that he had been arrested. Ilyich had only just managed to dodge the sleuths, and with the aid of Bask (then a prominent member of the co-operative movement) escaped to Finland, where he lived until the Stockholm Congress.

In April, while there, he wrote the pamphlet, *The Victory of the Cadets and the Tasks of the Workers' Party*. He prepared the resolutions for the United Congress, and came to Petersburg to participate in the discussion on them. This took place in the Wittmeyer's house where there was a gymnasium. The business was done in one of the classes.

The Bolsheviks and Mensheviks were meeting together in Congress for the first time since the Second Congress. Although the Mensheviks, in recent months, had very clearly displayed their

character, Ilyich still hoped that the new wave of Revolution, as to which he had no doubt, would affect them and reconcile them with the Bolshevik line.

I arrived at the Congress rather late. I went there with Tuchapsky, whom I had known formerly at the time of the preparatory work for the First Congress, and with Claudia Timofeyevna Sverdlova. Sverdlov had also intended coming to the Congress, but in view of the tremendous influence he wielded in the Urals the workers wanted to retain him there at all costs. I had a mandate from Kazan, but was short of a small number of votes. The credentials commission therefore only gave me a consultative vote. A brief spell in the credentials commission immediately brought one up against the real atmosphere of the Congress—it was decidedly factional.

The Bolsheviks maintained a very solid front. They were united by the belief that the Revolution, in spite of the temporary defeat, was on the up grade.

I remember how busy "Little Uncle" was. She had a good knowledge of the Swedish language, and therefore all the bother of fixing up the delegates fell on her shoulders. I also remember Ivan Ivanovich Skvortsov and Vladimir Alexandrovich Bazarov, whose eyes gleamed particularly brightly when he was in a fighting mood. Referring to this, Vladimir Ilyich remarked that Bazarov had a strong political streak in him, and was carried away by a fight. I can also recollect a ramble in the open country with Rykov, Stroyev and Alexinsky, when we talked about the moods of the workers. Others present at the Congress included Voroshilov (alias Volodya Antimekov) and K. Samoilova (Natasha Bolshevikova). These two latter pseudonyms, which savoured of youthful ardour, were characteristic of the humour of the Bolshevik delegates to the United Congress. The Bolshevik delegates came away from the Congress still more united than before.

On April 27th, on the opening of the First State Duma, there was a demonstration of unemployed, among whom Voitinsky was at work. The First of May was marked by great enthusiasm. At the end of April, in the place of *Novaya Zbiżn*, a new paper *Volna* ("The Wave") started publication. A little Bolshevik review (*Vestnik Zbiżni*) ("Herald of Life") also began to appear. Once more the movement was on the rise.

On returning from the Stockholm Congress we took quarters

on the Zabalkansky, I with the passport of Prascovia Onegin and Ilyich under a passport in the name of Tchkhaidze. There was a through courtyard, and living there was extremely peaceful save for the fact that our neighbour, some military man, engaged in deadly fights with his wife, beating her and dragging her up and down the corridor by her hair. Save also for the amiability of the landlady, who would ask continually and earnestly after Ilyich's relatives, assuring us that she knew him when he was a four-year-old youngster, only he had dark hair then.....

Ilyich wrote a report on the United Congress for the Petersburg workers, clearly elucidating all the differences on the most essential questions. "Freedom of discussion, but unity of action is what we must obtain," wrote Ilyich in this report. ".....In supporting the revolutionary activities of the peasantry, in criticising petty-bourgeois Utopian schemes, all Social-Democrats are in agreement." "On the elections to the Duma, complete unity of action is *imperative*. The Congress decided we should participate in the voting, wherever an election was taking place. During the actual elections there should be no criticism of the policy of participating in these elections. The *action* of the proletariat must be united."

The report was published by *Vperiod* in May.

On May 9th Vladimir Ilyich spoke in public for the first time since in Russia, at a huge mass meeting in the Patina House, under the name of Karpov. The hall was filled to overflowing by workers from all districts. The absence of police was striking. Two police inspectors who had buzzed around in the hall before the meeting commenced, had disappeared somewhere. "Someone must have sprinkled them with insect-powder," remarked a wag. After the Cadet Ogorodnikov, the Chairman called upon Karpov. I was standing among the crowd. Ilyich was very excited. For a minute he stood silent, terribly pale. All the blood had flowed to his heart. One immediately felt how the excitement of the speaker was being communicated to the audience. Suddenly tremendous hand-clapping commenced—the Party members had recognised Ilyich. I remember the uncomprehending, excited face of the worker standing next to me. He asked loudly: "Who is it, who is it?" But nobody answered him. The applause subsided. At the end of Ilyich's speech, all those present were swept with extraordinary enthusiasm—at that moment everyone was thinking of the coming fight to the finish.

Red-shirts were torn up for banners, and singing revolutionary songs they dispersed to their districts.

It was a white May night. One of those exhilarating white Petersburg nights. We had expected police, but they were not there. After the meeting, Ilyich stayed the night with Dmitri Ilyich Leshchenko.

Ilyich was not able to speak at any more big public meetings during that Revolution.

On May 24th they closed down *Volna*. May 26th we again started the paper under the title *Vperiod*, which existed until June 14th.

Only on June 22nd were we able to start publishing yet another Bolshevik paper—*Ekho* ("The Echo"), which continued to exist until July 7th. On July 8th there took place the dissolution of the State Duma.

At the end of June, Rosa Luxemburg arrived in Petersburg, just after her release from Warsaw gaol. Vladimir Ilyich and our leading Bolsheviks had a meeting with her. We were given an apartment for the appointment by "Papa Rode," an aged house-owner whose daughter had been a fellow-teacher with me in the Nevsky Gate district. Later, we had been in prison at the same time. The old chap tried to help in whatever way he could. On that occasion he set apart a big empty flat as a meeting-place, and thinking to give us greater secrecy he ordered all the windows to be whitewashed. This of course only had the effect of attracting the attention of all the watchmen. At that meeting we discussed the actual situation and the tactics that were to be employed. From Petersburg, Rosa went to Finland, and thence abroad.

In May, when the movement had begun to grow and the Duma to reflect the moods of the peasants, Ilyich attached very great importance to it. During that period he wrote the following articles: *The Workers' Group in the State Duma*; *The Peasant or 'Toilers' Group and the R.S.D.L.P.*; *The Land Question in the Duma*; *Neither Land nor Liberty*; *The Government, the Duma and the People*; *The Cadets Prevent the Duma from Appealing to the People*; *The Miserable Octobrists and Cadets*; *Bad Councils*; *The Cadets, the Trudoviks, and the Workers' Party*. All those articles had one object in view—the alliance of the working class with the peasantry; the necessity to rouse the peasants to the struggle for land and liberty; the need to deprive the Cadets of an opportunity to conclude a deal with the

### Government.

Ilyich spoke on this question several times during that period.

He spoke, for instance, at a meeting of representatives of the Vyborg District. This took place in the Engineers' Union on the Zabalkansky. We had to wait a long time. One room was occupied by the unemployed, and another by the dockers. Their organiser was Sergei Malyshev. The last time they had tried to come to terms with the owners, but this time they could not reach agreement. Only when they had gone could Ilyich give his report.

I also remember Ilyich speaking before an audience of teachers. Socialist-Revolutionary sympathies then prevailed among the teachers, and the Bolsheviks were debarred from the Teachers' Congress. A conference was convened, however, with a few score teachers. It took place in some school. Among those present I remember the face of one schoolmistress, slight of stature and hunch-backed. It was the S.R.\* Kondratieva. At that meeting Comrade Ryazanov gave a report on the trade unions. Vladimir Ilyich spoke on the agrarian question. He was opposed by the S. R. Bunakov who accused him of contradicting himself, and tried to quote Ilyin (Ilyich's pen-name at that time) against him. Vladimir Ilyich listened attentively, made notes, and afterwards made a rather angry reply to this S. R. demagoguery.

When the urgency of the land problem assumed its full proportions, when, to use Ilyich's words, "the union of the officials and the Liberals against the moujiks" was openly revealed, the wavering Toilers' Group went with the workers. The Government, feeling that it could not place further reliance on the Duma, opened the offensive. Peaceful demonstrations began to be broken up, incendiarism started in buildings used for public meetings, and pogroms commenced against the Jews. On June 20th a Governmental communiqué was issued on the agrarian question, sharply attacking the State Duma.

Finally, on July 8th, the Duma was dissolved, social-democratic newspapers were shut down, and all kinds of repressions and arrests started. In Kronstadt and Sveaborg a rebellion broke out. Our people took a most active part in it. Innokenty (Dubrovinsky) only just managed to get away from Kronstadt, slipping out of

\*i.e., Socialist Revolutionary.

the hands of the police by pretending to be hopelessly drunk. It was not long before our military organisation was arrested; it appeared that a *provocateur* had been in their midst. That happened just at the time of the Sveaborg revolt. On that day we waited in vain for telegrams about the progress of the rebellion.

We sat in the Menzhinskys' flat. At that time Vera Rudolfovna and Ludmilla Rudolfovna Menzhinsky had a very convenient apartment on their own. Comrades often came there. Comrades Rozhkov, Yuzef, and Goldenberg were always at their place. On that occasion also there were several comrades gathered there, including Ilyich. He sent Vera Rudolfovna with a message to Schlichter that he should immediately go to Sveaborg. Someone remembered that a comrade named Kharrik was employed as proof-reader on the Cadet paper *Rach* ("Speech"). I went to him to find out whether there were any telegrams. He was not in the office when I got there, but I received the telegrams from another reader. He advised me to come to an arrangement with Kharrik, who lived near by in Gussevsky Street. He even wrote Kharrik's address on the proofs of the telegrams. I went to Gussevsky Street. Outside the house two women were walking, arm in arm. They stopped me: "If you are going to number so-and-so, don't go in. There's a raid on, and they're arresting everybody." I hastened back to warn our people. As it afterwards transpired, that was where our military organisation was arrested, including Vyacheslav Rudolfovich Menzhinsky. The rebellion was crushed. The reaction grew more shameless. The Bolsheviks renewed publication of the illegal *Proletarii* and went underground. The Mensheviks beat a retreat, began to write in the bourgeois Press, put forward the demagogic slogan of a non-party workers' congress, which, under given conditions, meant liquidating the Party. The Bolsheviks demanded a special Congress.

Ilyich had to go away into "emigration near by," in Finland. He went to stay with the Leyteysens at Kaukola, not far from the station. The big uncomfortable country house, "Vaza," had for a long time served as a refuge for revolutionists. The people living there formerly were S. R.'s, who manufactured bombs. Afterwards the Bolshevik Leyteysen (Lindov) and his family lived there. Ilyich was given a room at the side of the house. Here he penned his articles and pamphlets, and had interviews with Central



Committee members, Petersburg Committee members, and others arriving from the provinces. From Kaukola, Ilyich actually directed the entire work of the Bolsheviks. After a while I also went to live there. I used to go up to Petersburg early in the morning and return late at night. The Leytseys afterwards went away and we occupied the whole of the lower part. My mother came to stay with us, and later Maria Ilyinichna lived with us for a time. The Bogdanovs came to live upstairs, and Dubrovinsky (Innokenty) came there in 1907. At that time the Russian police had decided not to meddle in Finland, and we had considerable freedom there. The door of the house was never bolted, a jug of milk and loaf of bread were left in the dining-room over night, and bedding spread on the divan, so that in the event of anyone coming on the night train they could enter without waking anybody, have some refreshment, and lie down to sleep. In the morning we often found comrades in the dining-room who had come in the night.

A special messenger came to Ilyich every day, with material, newspapers and letters. Ilyich, after looking over what had been sent, would immediately sit down to write an article and send it back by the same man. Dmitri Ilyich Leshchenko came to "Vaza" nearly every day. In the evenings I returned home with all kinds of news and commissions from Petersburg.

Ilyich was naturally aching to be back in Petersburg, and no matter how much they tried to maintain permanent contact with him he could not help getting into such a mood sometimes that he needed some distraction. Thus it was that the inmates of "Vaza" would sit down to play the game of "dunce." Bogdanov played with calculation, Ilyich both calculated and gambled, Leytseys became greatly enthralled. If at such moments someone happened to come on an errand from the District Committee, he would generally display annoyance and bewilderment. Fancy Central Committee members playing "dunce" for money! But it was only a phase.

Those days I seldom saw Ilyich, as I spent the whole day in Petersburg. Returning home late, I always found Ilyich pre-occupied, so I did not ask him questions, but rather told him about all I had seen and heard.

That winter Vera Rudolfovna and I established a permanent meeting-place in the dining-room of the Technological Institute.

It was very convenient, as a great number of people used the dining room in the course of a day. During the day we might see as many as a dozen comrades. No one took any notice of us. But I remember once when Kamo came for an appointment. Dressed in Caucasian costume, with rows of white-tipped cartridge cases, he carried some spherical object in a serviette. Everyone in the restaurant left off eating and began to stare at the unusual visitor. "He has brought a bomb," was the thought that probably flashed through the mind of the majority present. But it turned out to be not a bomb, but a water-melon. Kamo had brought the melon and some sugared nuts as a present for Ilyich and me. "My aunt sent them," he explained rather shyly. This fighting man, with his colossal courage, his unwavering strength of will and his fearlessness, seemed at the same time an extraordinarily unsophisticated fellow, a rather naïve and gentle comrade. He was passionately attached to Ilyich, Krassin, and Bogdanov. He used to come to see us at Kaukola. He made good friends with my mother, and told her all about his aunt and sisters. Kamo often travelled between Finland and Petersburg, and always went fully armed. Mother used to tie his revolvers on his back each time with particular care.

In the autumn the illegal paper *Proletarii* began to appear in Vyborg,\* and Ilyich devoted much time and attention to it. Contact was maintained through Comrade Schlichter. The illegal *Proletarii* was carried into Petersburg and distributed there among the districts. The circulation was managed by Comrade Irina (Lydia Gobi. Although this carriage and distribution was organised, and literature passed, through the legal Bolshevik press *Delo* ("The Cause"), it was nevertheless necessary to obtain addresses where literature could be despatched. Vera Rudolfovna and I needed an assistant. A district member, Komissarov, suggested his wife Katya for this job. A modest-looking woman with short hair arrived. The first moment a strange feeling came over me—a kind of acute mistrust. I could not think where this feeling came from, and it soon disappeared. Katya proved to be a very business-like assistant, did everything quickly, accurately, and with secrecy. She did not display any curiosity and asked no questions. I remember once, however, when I asked her where she was going in

\*The first number of *Proletarii* appeared on August 26th, 1906.

the summer, her expression seemed to change and she gave me rather a bad-tempered look. Later it turned out that both Katya and her husband were *agents provocateurs*. Katya, after having smuggled arms into Petersburg, took them on to the Urals. Immediately following her arrival there was a police raid, the arms transported by Katya were confiscated, and everybody arrested. We only found out about that a considerable time later. Meanwhile her husband had become caretaker for Simonov, owner of the house No. 9 Zagorodny Prospekt. Simonov used to help the Social Democrats. Vladimir Ilyich lived there at one time, and later his house was used for the Bolshevik Club. Alexinsky also lived there. Some time after—during the years of reaction—Komissarov put up any number of illegal comrades in that house, supplying them with passports. And afterwards these illegal comrades very soon “accidentally” came to grief on the frontier. For instance, Innokenty, returning once from abroad to work in Russia, fell into this trap. It was difficult of course to ascertain the actual moment Komissarov and his wife turned *provocateurs*. In any case, there was a very great deal the police did not find out, such as Vladimir Ilyich’s place of abode. In 1905 and the whole of 1906 the police apparatus was still considerably disorganised. The assembly of the Second State Duma was fixed for February 20th, 1907.

As far back as at the November Party Conference, fourteen delegates, including those from Poland and Lithuania, led by Ilyich, had been in favour of the elections to the State Duma, but against any *bloc* with the Cadets (as advocated by the Mensheviks). It was under that slogan that the Bolshevik work for the Duma elections was conducted. The Cadets were defeated at the poll. They only had half the number of deputies in the Second Duma that they had in the First. The elections were very belated. It appeared that a new revolutionary wave was rising. At the beginning of 1907 Ilyich wrote: “How miserable our recent ‘theoretical’ disputes now appear, when illuminated by the bright rays of the revolutionary sun now bursting forth!”

The deputies to the Second Duma came fairly often to Kaukola to talk with Ilyich. The work of the Bolshevik deputies was under the direct leadership of A. A. Bogdanov, but he lived at Kaukola, at “Vaza,” the same house as we, and discussed everything with Ilyich.

I remember once returning to Kaukola late one evening

from Petersburg. In the train I met Pavel Borisovich Axelrod. He said that the Bolshevik deputies, particularly Alexinsky, were not doing at all badly in the Duma. He began talking of the Workers' Congress. The Mensheviks were agitating fairly energetically for a Workers' Congress, hoping that a Congress on a broad basis would help them to counteract the ever-growing influence of the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks insisted on hastening the Party Congress. It was finally fixed for April. There was a very big attendance. The delegates came in throngs, coming before the Credentials Commission in a long file. The Bolshevik representatives on the Commission were Mikhail Sergeyevich and myself, while the Menshevik representatives were Krokmal and M. M. Schick (Khinchuk's wife). The police organised a watch. At the Finland railway station, Marat and several other comrades were arrested. We had to take most elaborate precautionary measures. Ilyich and Bogdanov had already gone to the Congress. I did not hurry back to Kaukola. I did not arrive home until the Sunday evening—and what did I find? Seventeen delegates were sitting in our place cold and hungry, having eaten and drunk nothing. The domestic worker who lived with us was a Finnish woman Social Democrat, and on Sundays had the entire day off. She spent her spare time staging performances at the People's Home. So it took me some considerable time before I could provide them all with food and drink. I was not at the Congress myself. There was no one to whom I could hand over the secretarial work, and those were difficult times. The police were getting more and more impudent. People began to be afraid to put Bolsheviks up for the night, or to let them use their houses for appointments. Sometimes I used to meet comrades in the *Vestnik Zhiizni* office. Peter Petrovitch Rumyantsiev, editor of the Review, found it embarrassing to tell me personally not to arrange any more interviews at the *Vestnik Zhiizni*, so he sent the watchman out to me—a worker with whom I had often discussed business. I was vexed that Rumyantsiev had not told me himself.

Ilyich returned from the Congress later than the rest. His appearance was most extraordinary: moustache clipped short, beard shaved off, and wearing a huge straw hat.\* June 3rd was

\*Immediately after the Congress, Ilyich made a report to a large number of workers who arrived from Petersburg. The speech was given at a hotel belonging to a Finn named Kakko. (Later, the hotel was set on fire.)

the day the Second Duma was dissolved. The entire Bolshevik fraction came to Kaukola late in the evening, and sat the whole night through discussing the situation that had arisen. Ilyich had become extremely fatigued from the Congress. He was overwrought, and could not eat. I prepared his things and packed him off to Stirsuden, in the heart of Finland, where "Little Uncle's" family lived. I remained, and hastily settled our affairs. When I arrived in Stirsuden, Ilyich had already recovered somewhat. They told me that the first few days he kept dozing off to sleep. He would sit down under a fir-tree and immediately drop off. The children called him "old drowsy." Those were wonderful days at Stirsuden: the woods, the sea, wildest of the wild. The only thing to spoil it was that next door was the big country house of the engineer Zyabitsky, where lived Leshchenko and his wife, and Alexinsky. Ilyich avoided conversations with Alexinsky, as he wanted to rest. The latter was offended. Sometimes we went to Leshchenko's to hear music. Xenia Ivanovna—a relative of the Knippovitch's—had a beautiful voice and was a professional singer. Ilyich listened with delight to her singing. We spent a good part of the day together by the sea or went for bicycle rides. The cycles were old and we were continually obliged to repair them—sometimes with the aid of the Leshchenkos, sometimes without. We mended punctures with old galoshes, and I think we did more repairing than riding. But it was wonderful when we did go out for rides. "Little Uncle" fed Ilyich assiduously on omelettes and reindeer-ham. Ilyich steadily got better and became his old self again.

From Stirsuden we went to a conference at Terioki. Having thought out the position during his leisure hours, Ilyich spoke at the conference against a boycott of the Third Duma. A fight now commenced on yet another front. This was the fight against the boycottists, who did not wish to reckon with grim realities, but who were intoxicated by their own high-sounding phrases. In the little country house where the meeting was taking place, Ilyich warmly defended his position. Krassin rode up on a bicycle and, standing by the window, listened attentively to Ilyich. Afterwards he did not go into the house, but walked away deep in thought. ....Indeed, there was plenty to think about.

Then came the Stuttgart Congress.\* Ilyich was very satisfied with it. He approved of the resolutions on trade unions and also of the attitude towards war.

\*The Stuttgart Congress was held from August 18th to 24th, 1907 (old style, 5th to 11th).

## XI

### AGAIN ABROAD, END OF 1907

Ilyich had to move on still farther into the heart of Finland. The Bogdanovs, Innokenty (Dubrovinsky), and I still occupied the house "Vaza," at Kaukola. There had already been searches at Terioki, and we expected them at Kaukola. Natalia Bogdanov and I "cleaned up," sorting all the archives, and picking out everything of value, which was given to a Finnish comrade to hide. The rest we burned. We burned so energetically that one morning I noticed that the snow all round "Vaza" was strewn with ashes. Incidentally, if the gendarmes had put in an appearance, they would still have found plenty to interest them. For large stacks of papers had accumulated in the house. We had to undertake special precautionary measures. One morning the landlady of the house ran in and said that the gendarmes had arrived in Kaukola. She grabbed as much illegal material as she could carry and took it to hide in her own place. We sent A. A. Bogdanov and Innokenty off for a walk in the woods, and ourselves remained to await the search. But that time they did not search "Vaza." They were looking for members of the military organisation.

In the depths of Finland, Ilyich stayed at Oglbu, a little station near Helsingfors, with two Finnish sisters. He felt quite out of place in that formidably clean, cold room. It was cosy in a Finnish way—there were lace curtains, and everything stood neatly in its place. From the next room continually came the sound of laughter, a piano, and chattering in the Finnish language. Ilyich spent whole days writing his work on the agrarian problem, carefully weighing up the experiences of the Revolution we had just gone through. He walked up and down the room for hours—on tiptoes, so as not to disturb the landladies. I believe I went to see him at Oglbu.

The police searched for Ilyich all over Finland. It became necessary to go abroad. It was clear that the reaction was going to drag on for years. We would again have to retire into Switzerland.

It was bitterly against our wish, but there was nothing else to be done. Moreover, it was necessary to arrange for the publication of *Proletarii* abroad, since this no longer remained possible in Finland. Ilyich was to travel to Stockholm at the first opportunity, and await me there. I had to make arrangements in Petersburg for my aged mother, who was ill, and fix up a great many other things, such as agreeing upon a system of communications. After everything was in order, I was to follow Ilyich.

While I was hurrying about in Petersburg, Ilyich very nearly lost his life in making his way to Stockholm. The fact was that they were tracking him down so persistently that to go in the usual way, i.e., by boarding the boat at Abo, would have meant being arrested for certain.\* There had already been cases of arrest when boarding the steamer. One of the Finnish comrades advised Ilyich to board the boat at a neighbouring island. This was safe in so far as the Russian police were not able to make arrests there. To get to the island, however, it was necessary to walk three versts over the ice, and although it was December the ice was unsafe in some parts. No one being desirous of risking his life, no guides were available. At last two rather tipsy Finnish peasants, who had been brought up on this sea-coast, undertook to escort Ilyich. And it was in crossing the ice at night that they and Ilyich very nearly perished. In one place the ice began to move away from beneath their feet. They only just managed to extricate themselves.

Borgo, a Finnish comrade (eventually shot by the White Guards), with whose aid I was sent to Stockholm, told me how dangerous a path had been chosen, and that Ilyich had escaped death by a mere chance. Ilyich told me that when the ice began to slide from beneath his feet, he thought, "Oh, what a silly way to have to die....."

Once more there started an exodus of Russians—Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, and S. R.'s—abroad. Travelling to Sweden on the same boat as myself were, Dan, Lydia Ossipovna Zederbaum, and a couple of S. R. people.

After a few days' sojourn in Stockholm, Ilyich and I went on to Geneva, via Berlin. The day before our arrival, Russians in Berlin had been subjected to searches and arrests. For this reason

\*Steamers went from Finland to Sweden in winter time, the track being cut by ice-breakers.



Comrade Abramov, the member of the Berlin group who met us, advised us not to call on any one at their home address, and led us round all day long from one café to another. We spent the evening with Rosa Luxemburg. The Stuttgart Congress, at which Vladimir Ilyich and Rosa Luxemburg had acted in accord on the question of war, brought them very close to one another. That was only 1907, but already at that Congress they both said the fight against war should not merely aim at fighting for peace, but should have as its goal the replacement of Capitalism by Socialism. A crisis engendered by war would have to be utilised in order to overthrow the bourgeoisie. Describing the decisions of this Congress, Ilyich wrote: "The Stuttgart Congress has brought out in sharp relief, on a whole number of important questions, the opposite positions of the opportunist and the revolutionary wings of international social democracy. And it has given a decision on these questions in the spirit of revolutionary Marxism." At the Stuttgart Congress Rosa Luxemburg and Ilyich had marched as one. For that reason their talk together that evening was particularly friendly.

When we returned to our hotel in the evening, we were ill. We both had white foam at the lips and a kind of weakness had seized us. It afterwards transpired that, in going about from one restaurant to another, we had got fish-poisoning somewhere. A doctor had to be summoned in the night. Vladimir Ilyich was registered as a Finnish cook and I as an American citizen. Therefore the chamber-maid fetched an American doctor. First he examined Vladimir Ilyich and said it was a very serious business. Then he looked at me and said: "Well, you'll live!" He prescribed us a heap of medicines, and guessing that something was not quite in order, he charged us outrageously for the visit. We hung about for a couple of days, and then dragged ourselves on, half-ill, to Geneva, where we arrived on January 20th, 1908. Ilyich afterwards wrote to Gorky that we had "caught a chill" on the way.

Geneva looked cheerless. There was no snow, but a cold, sharp wind was blowing. Picture-postcards of avalanches were on sale along the railings of the Geneva lake embankment. The town seemed dead and empty. Comrades living in Geneva at that time included Mikha Tsakhakaya, V. P. Karpinsky, and Olga Ravich. Mikha Tsakhakaya lived in a tiny room, and with difficulty roused himself from bed when we arrived. We talked little here. The Karpinskys were then living in the Russian library (late Kuklin's),

which Karpinsky managed. When we arrived he was suffering from a bad attack of headache which made him blink all the time. All the shutters were drawn to, as the light irritated him. When, on leaving Karpinsky, we walked along the empty Geneva streets, which had turned so friendless, Ilyich murmured, "I feel just as if I'd come here to be buried."

Our second period of emigration had started. It was ever so much harder than the first.

## APPENDIX

### LENIN'S METHOD OF WORK

No matter what work Vladimir Ilyich undertook, he did it extremely thoroughly. He himself did a tremendous amount of the ordinary routine work. The more importance he attached to any particular work, the more would he delve into all the details.

At the end of the 'nineties, Vladimir Ilyich saw how difficult it was to establish in Russia an illegal newspaper, appearing regularly. On the other hand he attached tremendous organisational and agitational importance to an all-Russian newspaper that would elucidate from the Marxist standpoint all the events and facts of actual Russian life and the working-class movement that was beginning to develop more and more widely. He therefore selected a group of comrades, and decided to go abroad and organise the publication of such a newspaper there. *Iskra* was conceived by him and organised by him. Every number received exhaustive attention. Every word was thought out. And—what is a very characteristic detail—Vladimir Ilyich himself corrected the proofs of the whole paper. This was not because there was no one else to read the proofs (I quickly adapted myself to this work), but because he was anxious that no errors should slip in. First he read the proofs himself, then passed them to me, then looked them over again.

And it was the same with everything. He put in a great deal of work, studying and drawing up agrarian statistics. His notebooks contain a large number of carefully written-out tables. When he was dealing with figures that were of great importance, he even checked the additions, etc., of the printed tables. The careful verification of every fact and every figure was typical of Ilyich. He based his conclusions on facts.

This eagerness to base every conclusion on facts is plainly revealed in his early propaganda pamphlets, *The Law on Fines*, *On Strikes*, and *The New Factory Law*. He did not foist anything on the workers, but proved his contentions with facts. Certain people

thought these pamphlets too long drawn-out. But the workers found them very convincing. Lenin's biggest work, written in prison—*The Development of Capitalism in Russia*—contains a tremendous amount of statistical material. Lenin, in whose life the reading of Marx's *Capital* played such a big role, remembered on what a great deal of statistical material Marx had based his work.

Lenin did not rely on his memory, although he had an excellent one. He never cited facts from memory, "approximately," but always gave them with the greatest accuracy. He looked through piles of material (he read with extraordinary rapidity, just as he wrote), but whatever he wanted to remember he wrote down in his note-books. A large number of these notes of his have been preserved. Once when looking over my brochure, *Organisation of Self-Education*, he said I was wrong in stating that notes should only be made on the most necessary things—his experience had been otherwise. He used to read over his notes several times, which is evident from the various remarks, underlinings, etc.

Sometimes, if the book were his own, he found it sufficient to make underlinings and marginal notes. On the cover he wrote the numbers of the pages marked, underlining them with one or several lines, according to the importance of the marked passages. He also re-read his own articles, making notes to them as well. Anything he noticed that led up to some new idea, he also underlined and noted the page on the cover. That was the way Ilyich organised his memory. He always remembered exactly what he had said, where, and in controversy with whom. In his books, speeches, and articles we find very few repetitions. It is true that over a period of years we encounter the same fundamental ideas in Ilyich's articles and speeches. This is because his utterances bear the imprint of a peculiar unity, a unique consistency. But we do not find just an ordinary repetition of something already uttered. The same fundamental idea is advanced but as applied to new conditions, in a new concrete setting, and treating the question from a new aspect. I remember a talk with Ilyich when he had already fallen ill. We were talking about the volumes of his complete works that had just appeared. We spoke of how they reflected the experience of the Russian Revolution, how important it was to make this experience accessible to foreign comrades. We agreed that the volumes published should be utilised to illustrate how the basic, cardinal idea must inevitably be treated in varying ways, dependent

on the changing concrete historical environment. Ilyich commissioned me to find a comrade who would carry out this work.

That has not yet been done, however.

Lenin carefully studied the experiences of revolutionary struggle of the world proletariat. These experiences are brought out very clearly in the works of Marx and Engels. Lenin read and re-read these works over and over again. He re-read them at every new stage of our Revolution. Everyone knows what a tremendous influence Marx and Engels had on Lenin. But it would be of great value to examine where and how the study of their works helped Lenin in estimating the contemporary situation and the perspectives of development at each stage of our Revolution. Such a work of research has not yet been written. But it would reveal with unexampled clarity how the experience of the world revolutionary movement assisted Lenin's power of foresight. Such a work would be invaluable to whomever is interested in how Lenin worked, how he studied Marx and Engels, what guidance he derived from them in estimating our struggle. It would show what a great influence the experience of the revolutionary working class of the most industrially advanced countries had on the whole of our revolutionary movement. Such a book would also make it easier to realise that the Russian Revolution—all our struggle and constructive work—was part of the world proletarian struggle. It would show *what* Lenin took from international working-class experience, *how* he took it, and how he applied it. That is something particularly important to be learnt from Lenin.

As to *how* to utilise the international workers' struggle, Ilyich himself wrote on more than one occasion. I remember what he said about one of Kautsky's pamphlets in this connection. Kautsky wrote a pamphlet on the Russian Revolution of 1905—*The Motive Forces and Perspectives of the Russian Revolution*. Ilyich was very pleased with this pamphlet. He immediately had it translated, himself corrected every phrase of the translation, and wrote a cordial preface to it. He asked me to see that it was printed without delay and to read the proofs myself. I remember how one big legal printing press worked three days, yet could not set up this small pamphlet, and how for three days there was nothing to do but to sit about in the printing works, waiting hours for the proofs. Ilyich was able to infect all those around him with his enthusiasm. Once he had spoken his mind in connection with Kaut-

sky's pamphlet, once he had written the preface—it was obvious that I would have to leave all other work and sit there at the press until I succeeded in getting the pamphlet out. And now, more than twenty years after, it is strange how my memory associates Lenin's fervent speeches with the grey cover, the type-faces and the printing errors of that pamphlet—born as it was in the labour-pangs of our then Russian technical inefficiency. I am also reminded of the concluding words in his preface to that pamphlet. He wrote: "In conclusion, a few words about 'authorities.' Marxists cannot adopt the viewpoint of the ordinary radical intellectual, with his allegedly revolutionary objectivity—'no authorities.' No. The working class, leading a difficult and stubborn world-wide fight for complete emancipation, needs authorities; but it stands to reason, only in the sense that every young worker needs the experience of the old *fighters* against oppression and exploitation. He needs the experience of those who have been through manifold strikes, who have participated in the ranks of the Revolution, who have become learned in revolutionary traditions and a wide political vision. The authority of the world-wide proletarian struggles is needed by us in order to elucidate the programme and tactics of our Party. But such authority of course has nothing in common with the official authorities of bourgeois science and police policy. Our authority is the authority of the many-sided struggle in the ranks of the universal Socialist army."

In his preface to *The Motive Forces and Perspectives of the Russian Revolution*, Vladimir Ilyich wrote that Kautsky made a correct approach to an appreciation of the Russian Revolution in saying: "We shall do well if we assimilate the idea that we are facing entirely new situations and problems, to which none of the old stock phrases will apply." In his preface to the pamphlet, Ilyich fervently assailed the application of stock phrases to new situations. Yet, as we know, Kautsky himself, in his estimation of the 1917 Revolution, was unable to understand the new situations and the new problems, and for that reason turned renegade.

To be able to study new situations and problems, in the light of the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the world proletariat, to apply Marxist method to the analysis of new concrete situations—that is the special substance of Leninism. Unfortunately, this aspect of the matter has not been sufficiently elucidated by concrete facts, though a good deal has been written on the subject.

There has been still less illustration in the Press of another aspect of Lenin's approach in estimating revolutionary events, namely, the ability to perceive the concrete reality and to distinguish the collective opinion of the fighting masses. This, according to Lenin, is a decisive factor in practical and concrete questions of future policy.

*Lenin on How to Write for the Masses*

"There is nothing I would like so much, there is nothing that I have hoped for so much, as an opportunity to write for the workers"—wrote Vladimir Ilyich from his exile in Siberia to P. B. Axelrod, abroad (letter dated July 16th, 1897).

But V. I. had written for the workers, already prior to 1897. In 1895 he wrote a pamphlet for workers, entitled *The Law on Fines*. That pamphlet was printed illegally in 1896 at the Lakhtinsky Press.

In 1895 the group of Petersburg Social Democrats afterwards known under the name of "League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class," which included Lenin, Krzhizhanovsky, Starkov, Radchenko, Vaneyev Silvin, Yakubova, and others, had as an object the publication of a working-class review, *Rabocheye Delo* ("Workers' Cause"). When the first number was already prepared, arrests took place, Vaneyev was taken with all the manuscripts, and that number never saw light. Vladimir Ilyich wrote an article for that review, entitled *What our Ministers are Thinking*.

Written with chemicals inside a book, Vladimir Ilyich sent out of prison two proclamations for workers: *The Workers' Festival—The First of May* and *To the Tsarist Government*.

Axelrod and Plekhanov gave a very good opinion of Ilyich's pamphlet, *The Law on Fines*.

In the above-mentioned letter to Axelrod, Ilyich wrote: "You and his (Plekhanov's) opinions on my literary attempts (for workers) have encouraged me tremendously."

Young workers, desirous of learning to write so as to be understood by the broad masses, should attentively study these works of Ilyich.

If we look at the pamphlet, *The Law on Fines*, we shall see that it is written in very simple language, but at the same time that it is far different from the superficial agitational material which is still

issued in such abundance even in these days. The pamphlet contains absolutely no agitational phrases or appeals. But the choice of theme itself is very characteristic. It is a theme which greatly exercised the minds of the workers in those days—a theme they were intimate with. The pamphlet starts off from facts well known to the worker, and is based throughout on facts carefully selected from a multitude of sources, and clearly set out. It is not the words in the pamphlet, but the facts, that talk and convince. These facts are so telling and so convincing that the workers upon acquaintance with them draw their own conclusions. The plan of the pamphlet also shows it has been carefully thought out. This is how it was planned: (1) What are fines? (2) How were fines formerly inflicted and what caused the new law on fines? (3) On what pretexts can the factory owners inflict fines? (4) How big can fines be? (5) What is the procedure for inflicting fines? (6) Where should the fine-money go, according to the law? (7) Is the law on fines applicable to all workers? (8) Conclusion.

The concluding section briefly formulates the deductions that the worker himself will already have made from the facts cited in the preceding sections, and merely helps him to generalise and finally formulate these conclusions. These conclusions are simple, but of great importance for the workers' movement.

In the short article, *What our Ministers are Thinking*, Lenin maintains the same approach to the reader as in *The Law on Fines*. He takes the letter of the Minister for the Interior, Durnovo, to the High Procurator of the Holy Synod, Pobedonosstsev, examines in detail its meaning, and brings the workers to the conclusion:

*"Workers, you see how deadly afraid our Ministers are of knowledge coming to the working people. Show everyone that no force can deprive the workers of their consciousness. Without knowledge the workers are defenceless; with knowledge they are a force."*

The proclamation, *The Workers' Festival—The First of May*, written from prison, also relates to the year 1896. But even if we were unaware of the year of its origin, we should easily recognise it from the nature of the proclamation itself. It dealt with the international working-class festival and the international struggle of the workers; but it started with the actual position and the struggle of the workers in the big centres. The proclamation outlined the prospects of this struggle and made a direct appeal for strikes.



The proclamation appeared on May 1st, 1896, and in June there were already 30,000 textile workers on strike in Petersburg.

The second proclamation, *To the Tsarist Government*, summed up the results of the strike and called for a further, more intense struggle. The proclamation ended with the words: "The strikes of 1895 and 1896 have not been in vain. They were of tremendous service to the Russian workers. They showed them the proper way to fight for their interests. They taught them to understand the *political position and the political needs of the working class.*"

In the autumn of 1897, Vladimir Ilyich worked on his second pamphlet for workers, written on the same theme as the first. This was *The New Factory Law*. In 1899 he wrote the pamphlets *On Industrial Courts* and *On Strikes*.

Working on these pamphlets helped Lenin to learn still better to write and talk in such a way that his speeches and articles would be particularly intimate and comprehensible to the mass.

From whom did Lenin learn to speak and write in such a popular style? He learned from Pisarev, whose works he read much of at one time, and from Chernyshevsky. But he learnt most from the workers themselves. He talked with them for hours, inquiring about all the petty details of their life in the factory, listening carefully to their casual remarks, and to the questions they put. He adjusted his observation to their level of knowledge, so that he could find out just what they did not understand on any given question, and why. Workers tell of these interviews in their reminiscences of Lenin.

But while working hard to assure that he conveyed his ideas to the workers in the clearest and best possible form, Ilyich at the same time remonstrated against all vulgarisation, all attempts to narrow the question down for the workers, to simplify its substance.

Ilyich wrote in *What is to be done?* (1901-1902): "Attention must be devoted principally to the task of *raising* the workers to the level of revolutionists, but without, in doing so, necessarily *degrading* ourselves to the level of the 'labour masses,' as the Economists wish to do, or necessarily to the level of the average workers, as *Svoboda* desires to do (and by this, raises itself to the second grade of Economist 'pedagogics'). I am far from denying the necessity for popular literature for the workers, and especially popular (but of course not vulgar) literature for the especially backward workers. But what annoys me is that pedagogics are confused with questions

of politics and organisation. You, gentlemen, who talk so much about the 'average workers,' as a matter of fact rather insult the workers by your desire to *talk down* to them, to stoop to them when discussing labour politics or labour organisation. Talk about serious things in a serious manner; leave pedagogics to the pedagogues, and not to politicians and organisers!" (*Collected Works of V. I. Lenin*, Vol. IV, English ed., p. 204).

Ilyich deprecated all "baby-talk" for workers, all substitution of serious arguments by "*adages or mere phrases*." (*Ibid.*)

In Lenin's speeches and articles the workers always saw that he was "talking seriously," as one worker put it.

Three years later (in June 1905) Vladimir Ilyich returned to the question alluded to in *What is to be done?* and wrote:

"In the political activity of a social-democratic party there always is, and will be, a certain element of tutoring; it is necessary to train the entire class of employed workers in their role as fighters for the emancipation of entire humanity from all oppression. It is necessary continually to teach ever new strata of this class. We must be capable of approaching the rawest, undeveloped members of this class—those less touched by our science, and the science of life—in such a way as to get closer to them. We must be able, with restraint and patience, to educate them up to social-democratic consciousness. In doing so we must not turn our teaching into a dry dogma, we must instruct not by books alone, but also by participating in the day-to-day life-struggle of these very same raw, these very same undeveloped, strata of the proletariat. In this everyday activity there is, we repeat, an element of tutoring. A Social Democrat who forgot such activity would cease to be a Social Democrat. That is true. But in these days some of us often forget that a Social Democrat who reduces political tasks to those of a teacher alone, also—though for a different reason—ceases to be a Social Democrat. Whoever should think to make such 'tutorship' a special slogan—to oppose it to 'politics,' to build upon such a contra-position a special tendency, appealing to the masses in the name of this slogan against social-democrat 'politics'—whoever did this would immediately sink to the depths of demagoguery." (Vol. VII, Russian edn., pp. 308-9).

That is simply an elaboration of what was said earlier, and defines what Ilyich demanded in respect of popular literature.

In 1903, when spontaneous peasant risings broke out, Ilyich

wrote a popular pamphlet, *To the Village Poor*, in which he explained to the poor peasants what the workers were fighting for, and why they should follow the workers.

In July 1905 Ilyich wrote his well-known leaflet, *Three Constitutions, or Three Systems of State Organisation* (Vol. VII, Russian edn., pp. 377-8). The leaflet compares an autocratic monarchy, a constitutional monarchy, and a democratic republic, both as regards their form, their content, and their aims. This leaflet is a model example of a lucid and popular style, but at the same time is an example of how to treat a question earnestly, how to "talk seriously."

At times of sharp and sudden turns in the situation, in the opinion of Ilyich, it is a special obligation to write and speak in a popular manner. At the April Conference, 1917, Vladimir Ilyich said:

*"Many of us, including myself, have had to speak before soldiers, and I think that if everything is explained from the class standpoint, what will be the most unclear to them in our policy is how precisely we desire to end the war, how we consider it possible to end it. There exists among the broad masses a haze of misunderstandings, a complete lack of comprehension of our position. We must therefore speak as popularly as possible."* (Vol. XIV, Part II, p. 416, old Russian edn.)

In the same speech, Lenin said: *"In speaking before the masses, we must provide concrete replies."* There should be clarity of political meaning. *"What is lacking in the slogan—'fraternise' is clarity of political meaning."* When saying that the proposed peace terms could not be put into effect without smashing the rule of the capitalists, Lenin insisted that this idea must be made clear to the masses.

"Once more I repeat: For the undeveloped masses of the people this truth demands intermediary channels, through which they may be introduced to the question. The error and the falseness of popular war literature consists in the fact that this question is avoided, is hushed up; things being represented as though there were no such thing as a class struggle, and as though two countries were living on friendly terms until suddenly one attacked the other and the latter defended itself. That is a vulgar interpretation which contains not a shade of objectivity. It is a conscious deception of the masses on the part of educated persons."

What are the conclusions to be drawn? Lenin attached great importance to the capacity to speak and write in a popular style. This is necessary in order to make Communism accessible and com-

prehensible to the masses, as their own cause. Popular speeches and popular literature should have a concrete object, one which urges to definite action. The political idea developed in a popular speech should be succinct and clear in its meaning. No vulgarisation, over-simplification, or departure from objectivity is permissible. The exposition should be planned in a lucid manner, should help the listener or reader himself to draw the conclusions, and only sum up and formulate these conclusions.

Statements should be based not on abstract arguments, but on facts closely concerning the listener or reader. These facts should be gradually explained, link by link, in connection with the most important questions of class struggle, with the most important questions of Socialist construction.

That is how Lenin taught us to speak and write popularly.

At the present moment popular literature is of particular importance. The sharpened class struggle makes it essential that the masses understand the situation as clearly as possible, that they understand how to link up the current facts of day-to-day life with the fundamental questions of the fight for Socialism. We have absurdly little of such literature. It is necessary to produce it. Both from Lenin and from the masses, we must learn to write in a popular style, must set ourselves to the collective work of improving this kind of writing, and must test in practice the success of our results.

### *Lenin and Chernyshevsky*

I want to say a few words about the influence Chernyshevsky had over Vladimir Ilyich. In his articles and books, Vladimir Ilyich never spoke directly of this influence, but every time he spoke about Chernyshevsky it was with ardour. When one reads the works of Vladimir Ilyich, one sees that wherever he speaks of Chernyshevsky he does so with particular warmth. In Lenin's pamphlet, *What is to be done?* there is an indirect allusion to Chernyshevsky's influence. Speaking of the period preceding the foundation of the Party, the period between 1894 and 1898, when the workers' movement was beginning to develop rapidly, and assume a mass character, Lenin pointed out that the youth belonging to this movement developed and were trained in the glamour of the revolutionary activity of the old revolutionaries. He pointed

out that they had to pay the price of a big internal struggle in order to free themselves illogically from the influences of these revolutionary predecessors, and to follow a different path—that of Marxism. That characteristic contains an autobiographical element.

As a personality, Chernyshevsky influenced Vladimir Ilyich by his intransigence, his tenacity, and by the dignified and proud way he bore his unprecedentedly hard fate. Thus everything Vladimir Ilyich said about Chernyshevsky breathes of a particular respect for his memory. During difficult moments, when we have experienced grave periods in our Party work, Vladimir Ilyich liked to repeat one passage from Chernyshevsky, where he said, "the revolutionary struggle is not the Nevsky Prospekt pavement." Vladimir Ilyich quoted that in 1917, when the reaction made itself particularly keenly felt, and when the Party had to make a retreat. In 1918 also, when all the difficulties confronting the Soviet Power became particularly threatening, when it was necessary to conclude the Brest-Litovsk peace and conduct a civil war—Ilyich recalled these words of Chernyshevsky. From the example of Chernyshevsky he gathered strength and often repeated that a revolutionary Marxist should always be ready for anything.

But Chernyshevsky influenced Lenin not merely as a personality. If we look at Vladimir Ilyich's first illegal composition—*Who are the Friends of the People?*—we see very clearly the influence Chernyshevsky had on Lenin. The generation about whom Vladimir Ilyich spoke, the youth who belonged to revolutionary Social Democracy in 1894, grew up in an environment where there resounded—in literature, everywhere—only lip-service in regard to Peasant Reform. Chernyshevsky was able to appreciate this correctly, as Mikhail Nikolaevich (Prof. Pokrovsky) has said. And, as Vladimir Ilyich remarked: it needed all the genius of a Chernyshevsky, to give, in the very epoch of the Peasant Reform, the estimation of Liberalism that he gave, to expose the treacherous role of this Liberalism, its class substance.

If we review Lenin's subsequent activity, we see that Chernyshevsky infected him with his intransigent attitude to Liberalism. Mistrust in Liberal phrases, in the whole position of Liberalism, runs like a red thread throughout all Lenin's activity. If we take the Siberian Exile and the protest against the *Credo*, if we take the break with Struve, and afterwards, the uncompromising attitude

Lenin occupied towards the Cadets, towards the Menshevik-liquidators who were prepared to make a deal with the Cadets—we see that Vladimir Ilyich maintained the same intransigent line that Chernyshevsky adopted towards the Liberals who betrayed the peasantry at the time of the Reform of 1861. If we now survey this attitude of Lenin's, this uncompromising position of his, we see that it was thanks to this intransigence, which was also maintained by the Party, that the Party was able to be victorious. The question of the attitude towards the Liberal bourgeoisie is closely bound up with the question of democracy. In *Who are the Friends of the People?* Lenin wrote: "In Chernyshevsky's epoch, the fight for democracy and the fight for Socialism merged into one indivisible whole." Giving an estimation of bourgeois-Liberal democracy and the democracy of the Narodniks of the 'eighties who had fallen under the influence of the bourgeoisie and become reconciled with Tsarism, Lenin opposed to it the democracy of revolutionary Marxism. Chernyshevsky gave an example of uncompromising struggle against the existing order, a struggle in which democracy was closely bound up with the fight for Socialism.

Lenin valued the activities of Chernyshevsky, his real democracy, for he perceived the harmony of this democracy with the Marxist attitude to the masses. The teachings of Marxism not only shed light on the economic struggle proceeding between the working class and the capitalists. Marxism took the phenomenon in its entirety; explained the whole system, giving an analysis of it and at the same time showing how to merge the fight for democracy and the fight for Socialism into one. If we observe how Marx opposed Lassalle, on what grounds they fought, how indignant Marx was that Lassalle did not understand the significance of the revolutionary initiative of the masses, we shall understand the Socialist substance of revolutionary Marxism. It was not understood at all, for instance, by the so-called "Legal Marxists," who constantly shut their eyes to Marx's permanent orientation on the working class, on the masses. In Marxism, democracy and the fight for Socialism are indeed combined into one unbreakable chain. It is thus no mere chance that when Vladimir Ilyich referred to questions of democracy, he always remembered Chernyshevsky, from whom he first learnt of this combined struggle for democracy and Socialism. If we examine the teachings on Soviets, on the Soviet power, we see that precisely in these teachings on the Soviet system is the com-

bination' of the struggles for democracy and for Socialism put into force and most fully reflected. I remember when, in 1918, I was preparing to write a popular pamphlet on Soviets and the Soviet Power, Vladimir Ilyich once brought me a cutting from the French paper *L'Humanité*—I forget the name of the French comrade who wrote it—which said that the Soviet system was the most profoundly and consistently democratic system. On giving me that cutting, Vladimir Ilyich said it was precisely to that aspect of the question that I should draw particular attention. It was necessary to show the complete genuine democracy which is contained in the very structure of the Soviet system, where the proletariat is rising to a new and broader democracy.

Marx was translated into the Russian language as far back as in the 'sixties. But Marx had still to be translated into the language of Russian facts. Lenin did that in his book, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. He was able to do it, thanks to Chernyshevsky's influence over him. Vladimir Ilyich several times reminded us how well acquainted Chernyshevsky was with actual Russian life, how well he knew the facts concerning the buying out of the peasantry, etc.

In the first period of his revolutionary activity, Vladimir Ilyich paid less attention to Chernyshevsky's philosophical convictions, although he was also acquainted with Plekhanov's little book, *On Chernyshevsky*, where particular attention was paid to the philosophical aspect. He was less interested, however, in this question. Only in 1908, when a big fight broke out on the philosophical front, only then did he once more re-read Chernyshevsky and talk of him as a great Russian Hegelian, a great Russian materialist. Later, in 1914, when the war began to draw nearer, and the national question assumed a particular topical importance, Vladimir Ilyich, in his article *National Self-Determination*, specially emphasised the fact that Chernyshevsky, like Marx, understood the whole meaning of the Polish insurrection.

It is in the light of all these factors that we see what profound influence Chernyshevsky had over Lenin, over his entire revolutionary activity. Hence Lenin's attitude towards him is also comprehensible. In Siberia Vladimir Ilyich had an album in which there were photographs of the writers who had a particularly strong influence on him. Next to Marx and Engels, and next to Hertzén and Pisarev, were two photos of Chernyshevsky, and also

one of Myshkin, who tried to set Chernyshevsky free. And in recent times, in Lenin's study in the Kremlin, among the writers he permanently wished to have at hand, on the same shelves as Marx, Engels, and Plekhanov, also stood the complete works of Chernyshevsky, which Vladimir Ilyich read again and again in his free moments.

In that same book, *Who are the Friends of the People?* Vladimir Ilyich points out that Kautsky was right to say, in speaking of Chernyshevsky's epoch, that then every Socialist was a poet and every poet was a Socialist. Vladimir Ilyich read fiction, studied it and liked it. But there was one thing about Ilyich's novel-reading—he blended together the social approach with the artistic representation of life. He apparently did not separate these two things, and just as Chernyshevsky's sociological ideas are fully reflected in his works of fiction, so Vladimir Ilyich, when choosing a novel, had a special liking for books in which various social ideas were clearly reflected in the literary work.

What conversations we had together on the subject, I no longer remember. As years go by one forgets a great deal, every day something new happens, and we do not remember the particular words of a conversation, but only the gist. I think, however, the books, articles, and pamphlets of Vladimir Ilyich reflect sufficiently fully the great influence Chernyshevsky had over him.

### *The Kind of Fiction that Pleased Ilyich*

The comrade who first introduced me to Vladimir Ilyich told me he was a very erudite man; that he exclusively read learned books, had never read a novel in his life, and never read poetry. I was astounded. When I was young myself I had read all the classics, knew by heart practically all Lermontov and the rest, while writers like Chernyshevsky, L. Tolstoy, and Uspensky, seemed a very significant factor in my life. It seemed incredible to me that here was a man who had not the slightest interest in all that.

Later, when we worked together, when I came to know Ilyich more intimately, I found out his evaluation of people, observed his diligent study of life, and humanity; how he never substituted for the study of the living man the practice of dipping into books



to see how people lived.

But life then was such that there never seemed to be an opportunity to talk on this theme. Later, when we were already in Siberia, I discovered that Ilyich had perused the classics no less than I had. For instance, not only had he read all Turgeniev, but had re-read him more than once. He had an intimate knowledge of Nekrassov and Chernyshevsky. I took the works of Pushkin, Lermontov, and Nekrassov to Siberia with me. Vladimir Ilyich placed them by the side of his bed, along with Hegel, and read them in the evenings, over and over again. Pushkin he liked best of all; but he not only valued good style. For example, he liked Chernyshevsky's novel, *What is to be done?* in spite of its not being a great example of literary art, and its naïve form. I was surprised to see how attentively he read that novel, and how he took note of all the very fine nuances that are to be found in it. At one time Vladimir Ilyich read a great deal of Pisarev, and liked him immensely. In Siberia we also had Goethe's *Faust* in German, and a little volume of Heine's poems.

On returning to Moscow from Siberia, Vladimir Ilyich once went to a theatre to see *Henschel the Izvostchik*. He afterwards said he liked it very much.

In Munich, among the books Ilyich liked were Gerhardt's *Bei Mama* and *Büttnerbauer* ("The Peasant") by Pollenz.

Later, during our second emigration, in Paris, Ilyich eagerly scanned Victor Hugo's poems, *Châtiments*, devoted to the 1848 Revolution. These were written by Hugo during the time he was out-lawed, and secretly imported to France. These poems contain a good deal of naïve bombast, but one nevertheless feels in them the breeze of the Revolution. Ilyich was very fond of going to various cafés and suburban theatres to listen to the revolutionary singers who sang in the working-class districts—about the peasants, who, while half-drunk, elect some carpet-bag agitator to the Chamber of Deputies; about child-education; about unemployment—indeed, about everything. Ilyich was particularly fond of Montègues. The son of a Communist, Montègues was a favourite in the working-class suburbs. It is true, his improvised songs—always on some vivid topical theme—expressed no definite ideology, but they contained a great deal of sincere feeling. Ilyich frequently sang his "Greetings to the Seventeenth Regiment"—who had refused to fire on strikers: "Salut, salut à vous, soldats du 17-me." Ilyich

once had a talk with Montègues at a Russian evening gathering, and it was curious to see these two extremely different people—when the war broke out, later, Montègues went over to the Chauvinists—confiding to one another their dreams of the World Revolution. That happens sometimes—people who hardly know each other meet in a railway-carriage, and to the music of the rushing train, talk about most cherished things, about things they would never speak of on other occasions. Then they part, never to meet again. It was the same on that evening. What is more, the conversation was in French, and in a foreign language one can talk day-dreams more easily than in one's own tongue. A French char-woman used to come to us for two hours a day. Ilyich once listened to her singing. It was an Alsatian nationalist song:

“Vous avez pris Alsace et Lorraine;  
Mais malgré vous nous resterons français;  
Vous avez pu germaniser nos plaines  
Mais notre cœur—vous ne l'aurez jamais !”

(“You have taken Alsace and Lorraine; but in spite of you we shall remain French. You could Germanise our plains, but you shall never have our hearts.”)

This was in 1909—the time of reaction. Our Party was broken up, but its revolutionary spirit was by no means smashed. And the spirit of that song was in keeping with Ilyich's mood. How triumphantly the words of the song resounded on his lips:

“Mais notre cœur—vous ne l'aurez jamais !”

During those most difficult years of the reaction, years about which Ilyich always spoke with such pain, even when we were back in Russia—he sustained himself by dreaming; dreaming as he talked to Montègues, dreaming as he victoriously chanted that Alsatian song, and when during sleepless nights he read Verhaeren.

Later on, during the war, Vladimir Ilyich was fascinated by Barbusse's *Le Feu*, to which he attached immense significance. That book was in such concord with his feelings at that time.

We seldom went to a theatre. We might pay an occasional visit, but the inane nature of the play, or the artificiality of the acting, always jarred on Ilyich's nerves. Generally, we left the theatre after the first act. Comrades used to make fun of us for not taking our money's worth.

But once Ilyich did sit to the end. I think that was at the end of 1915, in Berne, when they were showing L. Tolstoy's play, *The Living Corpse*. Although it was performed in German, the actor who took the part of the prince was a Russian, and knew how to interpret Tolstoy's ideas. Ilyich followed the play with intensity and excitement.

And, finally in Russia. The new art seemed foreign and incomprehensible to Ilyich. Once in the Kremlin we were invited to a concert arranged for Red Army men. Ilyich was placed in one of the front rows. The actress, Gzovskaya, was declaiming a Mayakovsky poem:

"Our god—the advance,  
Our heart—the drum,"

and she advanced straight on Ilyich. He sat there rather taken aback, and bewildered by this unexpected gesture. When Gzovskaya was followed by some actor who read Chekhov's *The Evil-doer*, he heaved a sigh of relief.

One evening Ilyich wanted to go and see how the Youth commune was living. We decided to pay a visit to our young art student, Varya Armand. I think that was the day of Kropotkin's funeral, in 1921. It was the famine year, but the youth were full of enthusiasm. They slept in the Commune almost on bare boards; they had no bread. "But we have some grain," said the art student who was on duty that day, with face beaming. They cooked some "kashá" (gruel) for Ilyich out of that grain, although there was no salt. Ilyich looked at the faces of these glowing boy and girl artists standing around him—and their joy was reflected on his face also. They showed him their naïve drawings, explained their meaning, showered questions on him. But he smiled, and evading a reply, answered their questions by himself asking questions: "What do you read? Do you read Pushkin?"—"Oh, no," someone blurted out. "He was a bourgeois. Mayakovsky for us." Ilyich smiled. "I think Pushkin is better." After that Ilyich somewhat took to Mayakovsky. Whenever he heard that name it reminded him of those young art students, full of life and joy, ready to die for the Soviets, and, not finding in the contemporary language words to express themselves, sought this expression in Mayakovsky's rather obscure verse. Later, Ilyich once praised

Mayakovsky for verses deriding Soviet bureaucracy. Of the modern writers I remember he liked Ehrenburg's novel describing the war. "You know that Ilya Lokhmaty (Ehrenburg's pseudonym)—well, he's made a fine job of it," he once eulogistically declared.

We went a few times to the Moscow Art Theatre. Once we saw *The Flood*. Ilyich liked it immensely. We wanted to go to the theatre again the next day. They were playing Gorky's *The Lower Depths*. Ilyich liked Alexiei Maximovich (Gorky), as a man to whom he was already closely attracted as long ago as the London Congress. He liked him also as an artist, and considered that as an artist Gorky could express very much in a few words. He used to talk particularly frankly with Gorky. Therefore it went without saying that Ilyich was keenly critical of the acting of a Gorky play. He thought the production of this play too theatrical, and it irritated him. After *The Lower Depths* he gave up going to the theatre for a long time. I believe we went another time to see Chekov's *Uncle Vanya*. He liked it. And, finally, the last time we went to the theatre was in 1922, to see Dicken's *Cricket on the Hearth*. Ilyich was already bored after the first act. Dickens' middle-class sentimentality began to get on his nerves and when the dialogue commenced between the old toy-seller and his blind daughter, Ilyich could stand it no longer, and walked out in the middle of the act.

During the last months of his life I used to read to him whatever literature he selected, usually at evening time. I read Shchedrin, and I read Gorky. He also loved listening to poetry, especially Demyan Bedny. But of Demyan's verses he preferred those with pathos to the satirical ones.

As I read him poetry he would gaze musingly out of the window at the setting sun. I remember the poem ending with the words, "Never, never, will Communists be slaves."

In reading it, it was just as though I were repeating a vow to Ilyich—"Never, never, will we give up a single conquest of the Revolution....."

Two days before his death I read to him in the evening a tale of Jack London, *Love of Life*—it is still lying on the table in his room. It was a very fine story. In a wilderness of ice, where no human being had set foot, a sick man, dying of hunger, is making for the harbour of a big river. His strength is giving out, he cannot walk but keeps slipping, and beside him there slides a wolf—also

dying of hunger. There is a fight between them: the man wins. Half dead, half demented, he reaches his goal. That tale greatly pleased Ilyich. Next day he asked me to read him more Jack London. But London's strong pieces of work are mixed with extraordinarily weak ones. The next tale happened to be of quite another type—saturated with bourgeois morals. Some captain promises the owner of a ship laden with corn to dispose of it at a good price: he sacrifices his life merely in order to keep his word. Ilyich smiled and dismissed it with a wave of the hand.

That was the last time I read to him.....

## NOTES

1. **NARODNIKI:** "Populists." Members of the parties "Zemlya Ivolya" and "Narodnaya Volya" (See Note 2.)
2. **NARODNAYA VOLYA:** "People's will." A Russian revolutionary Party pursuing terrorist tactics, and most active at the end of the 'seventies and beginning of the 'eighties of the last century. Considered to be the predecessors of the Socialist Revolutionary Party.
3. **ARTEL:** A group working on a co-operative basis.
4. **GOROKHOVAYA:** The site of the Tsarist secret-police office in St. Petersburg.
5. **EMANCIPATION OF LABOUR GROUP:** The group of revolutionary Social Democrats, most prominent of whom were George V. Plekhanov, Vera Zassulich, and P. B. Axelrod. Emigrating to avoid Tsarist persecution, they founded the group in Switzerland in 1883, for the propaganda of Marx's ideas in Russia and to combat the Narodniks, who denied that the working class was destined to lead the revolution. This group, together with Lenin's *League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class* (founded in 1895 in Petersburg) and other Social Democrat groups, combined in forming the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (1898). After the Party split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks (in 1903), Plekhanov's group joined the Mensheviks.
6. **DEKABRISTS:** Nickname for those arrested in December 1895. The original "Dekabrists" (Decembrists) were of course the people concerned in the rising of December 1825.
7. **NARODOPRAVETZ:** Member of a revolutionary movement of the 'seventies—precursors of the Narodnaya Volya. Tyutchiev himself had been an active propagandist among factory workers.
8. **FIRST OF MARCH EXILES:** Those members of the "Narodnaya

Volya" exiled in connection with the assassination of Tsar Alexander II on March 1st, 1881. It was for participating in this attempt that Lenin's brother Alexander Ilyich was executed.

9. **LEF:** Abbreviation for *Left Front*, organ of Mayakovsky's Proletarian-Futurist Group, published in Moscow after the Revolution.
10. **THE CREDO:** The Credo was the name given to a declaration drawn up by Madame Kuspova on behalf of the socialist group known as the "Economists," in which it was urged that it was not the business of the working class to engage in political action. The document was not called the Credo by its authors, but was so named by Lenin's sister, who transmitted the document to him. Since then The Credo is the title by which the "Economists' " declaration of faith has been known.
11. **BUND:** A Jewish Social Democratic Party working mainly in Russian Poland.
12. **MARIA AND ANNA ILYINICHNA ULYANOVNA:** Lenin's two sisters. Both active in the Revolutionary movement all their lives. Now hold prominent positions in the Communist Party. Maria Ilyinichna as secretary of *Pravda* editorial, Anna Ilyinichna in the Party History Department.
13. **THE NORTHERN LEAGUE** was organised in Russia in 1901 and embraced the social-democratic organisations in the Yaroslav, Vladimir, and Kostroma provinces.
14. **"RABOCHEYE DELO"** (*Worker's Cause*), organ of the Economists.\* Economism was the term used to denote the tendency among Social Democrats which believed Tsarism could be fought by economic means alone (strikes, etc.), and neglected the political struggle.
15. **THE PARTY PROGRAMME** remained in force right up to the Eighth Congress in 1919, when it was amended to meet the contingencies of the new situation, where the working class was in power.
16. **M. I. KALININ** is now the President of the Central Executive Committee of Soviets of the U.S.S.R.—the highest State position.

17. DMITRY ILYICH ULYANOV. Lenin's younger brother.
18. R.S.D.L.P. This title was retained by both factions after the split. But at the Seventh Congress in 1918, the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) changed the Party title to Russian Communist party (Bolsheviks). Later it became the "Communist Party of the Soviet Union."
19. "VPERIOD" (*Forward*): The first independent Bolshevik paper published abroad. Later renamed *Proletarii*.
20. JANUARY 9TH, 1905: Known as "Bloody Sunday." A procession of workers—men, women, and children—headed by a priest, Father Gapon, approached the Winter Palace, Petersburg, to present a petition to the Tsar. They were fired on by infantry and charged by cavalry, 200 being killed and about 1,000 wounded. The massacre was followed by street fighting in different parts of the city; and the whole working class of Russia began a strike of protest.
21. OF A CONCILIATORY DISPOSITION: i.e., desirous of reconciling the opinions of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.
22. "KOMITETCHIK": Nickname for the members of the illegal local Party Committees working in Russia.
23. CADETS: Members of the Constitutional Democratic Party (so called from the Party's initials, C D); the Party of the Liberal Capitalists, one of the leading components of the Provisional Government after the fall of the Tsar.
24. KSHESSINSKAYA HOUSE: Kshessinskaya was a ballerina and mistress of Tsar Nicholas II. After the February Revolution, the Bolsheviks seized her mansion and made it their headquarters. The Central Committee and the Petrograd Committee of the Bolshevik Party were housed here.
25. SHIDLOVSKY COMMISSION: The commission appointed by the Government after the events of January 1905, "to inquire into the discontent among the people, and make recommendation for removing the causes thereof." It produced the proposal for a Duma, elected on a franchise which excluded all workers and poor intellectuals; was to be of a purely deliberative character, meeting only 2½ months in the year; "subject to an Upper House which was to consist of the existing Council of State, nominated by the Tsar."





# PART TWO

## I

### INTRODUCTION

The second enforced exile may be divided into three periods:

*The first period* (1908-11) was the period of the most rabid reaction in Russia. The tsarist government took cruel revenge on the revolutionaries. The prisons were overcrowded; prison conditions were brutal; the infliction of corporal punishment was a common practice; death sentences followed one after another. The illegal organisations were compelled to go deep under ground, but it was not easy to conceal them. During the revolution the character of the membership of the Party had changed; many members had joined who were not familiar with pre-revolutionary work and were not accustomed to the rules of secrecy. Moreover the tsarist government spared no money for the organisation of espionage and provocation. Its system of espionage was exceedingly well planned, had wide ramifications and even penetrated the central organs of the Party. The government's secret service was excellently organised.

Even the legal organisations, trade unions and the press were systematically persecuted. The government exerted every effort to deprive the masses of the workers of the rights they had won during the revolution. But a return to the past was impossible. The revolution had taught the masses a great deal, and the initiative of the workers again and again found outlets for their activities in every crevice of the police system.

Those were the years of the greatest ideological confusion among the Social-Democrats. Attempts were made to revise the principles of Marxism; new philosophic movements tried to shake the materialistic philosophy upon which the entire Marxian theory is based. The outlook was gloomy in the extreme. Attempts were made to find a way out by concocting a new, subtle religion and giving it a philosophical basis. At the head of this new philosophical school, which

opened its doors to every "god seeker" and "god creator," stood Bogdanov supported by Lunacharsky, Bazarov and others. Marx arrived at Marxism by the path of philosophy, through the struggle against idealism. Plekhanov in his time had devoted considerable attention to the enunciation of the materialistic philosophy. Lenin studied their works and philosophy generally very intensively while in exile. He could not ignore the significance of this attempt to revise the philosophic bases of Marxism and its relative importance during the years of reaction. And so he came out most strongly in opposition to Bogdanov and his school.

Bogdanov was an opponent not only on the philosophic front. He gathered about him the Otzovists and the Ultimatumists.\*

The Otzovists maintained that the State Duma had become so reactionary that the Social-Democratic members should be recalled from it. The Ultimatumists were of the opinion that an ultimatum should be presented to the Social-Democratic members of the Duma calling upon them to make such speeches in the Duma as would cause them to be ejected. In essence, there was no difference between the Otzovists and the Ultimatumists. Among the Ultimatumists were Alexiusky† Marat and others. The Otzovists and Ultimatumists were opposed to the Bolsheviks taking part in the work of the trade unions and of the legal organisations. Bolsheviks, they said, must be hard and unyielding. Lenin disagreed with their point of view. He argued that if it were adopted it would mean abstention from all practical work, isolation from the masses, and failure to organise them for the purpose of fighting for their vital interests. In the period before the 1905 Revolution the Bolsheviks were able to utilise every legal possibility to forge ahead and to lead the masses under the most trying conditions. They began with the struggle for the daily needs of the workers such as demanding that the employers provide hot water for tea, proper ventilation,

\* Otzovists—From the Russian word "otzvat" meaning to "recall," Ultimatumists—From the word "ultimatum"—*Ed.*

† Later became a renegade, and after the February Revolution, 1917, circulated a document which was intended to prove that Lenin was in the pay of the Germans.—*Ed.*

etc., and from this led the masses, step by step, to the general armed insurrection. The ability to adapt oneself to the most difficult conditions and at the same time to maintain the revolutionary positions—such were the traditions of Leninism. The Otzovists broke with Bolshevik traditions. Hence, the fight against Otzovism was the fight for the tried and tested Bolshevik Leninist tactics.

Finally, these years (1908-11) were years of sharp struggle for the Party and for its illegal organisation.

Naturally, the first to be affected by the spirit of pessimism in the period of reaction were the Mensheviks, who, even before this time had tended to swim with the stream and to tone down revolutionary slogans; and had been closely bound up with the liberal bourgeoisie. This pessimistic mood was very strikingly expressed in the effort of a large section of the Mensheviks to dissolve the Party. The liquidators, as they were called, maintained that the existence of an illegal party leads to police raids and arrests, and restricts the scope of the labour movement. But in reality, the liquidation of the illegal party would have meant abandoning the independent policy of the proletariat, subduing the revolutionary spirit of the proletarian struggle, and weakening the organisation and the unity of action of the proletariat. The liquidation of the Party would have meant abandoning the principles and tactics of Marx.

Of course, Mensheviks like Plekhanov, who had done so much for the propagation of Marxism, and for the struggle against opportunism, could not but realise that the moods in favour of dissolving the Party were reactionary, and when propaganda in favour of the liquidation of the Party began to grow into propaganda in favour of repudiating the very principles of Marxism, Plekhanov completely dissociated himself from the liquidators and formed a group of his own known as the "Party-Mensheviks."

The struggle for the Party which developed helped to clear up a number of organisational questions, and the rank and file of the Party obtained a better understanding of the role of the Party and of the duties of its members.

The struggle for the materialistic philosophy, for close connection with the masses, for Leninist tactics and for the Party was waged in the conditions and environment of exile.

During the years of reaction, the number of exiles from Russia increased enormously; people fled from the severe persecution of the tsarist regime, their nerves worn and shattered, with no prospects for the future, penniless and without any help from Russia. All this served to give the political struggle exceptional acerbity. Of squabbling and bickering there was more than enough.

Looking back on this period now, after so many years, the issue around which the struggle centred is transparently clear. Now that experience has so definitely proved the correctness of Lenin's policy, this struggle seems to many to be of little interest; but without it the Party would not have been able to develop its work so quickly during the years of the revival of the movement and its path to victory would have been more difficult. The struggle took place when the above-mentioned trends were just developing and was fought between those who, only recently, had been fighting side by side, and to many it seemed that the trouble was due to Lenin's quarrelsomeness, his brusqueness and bad temper. In reality, however, it was a struggle for the very existence of the Party, for a consistent Party policy and for correct tactics. The sharp form the controversy assumed was due to the complicated nature of the questions discussed, and Ilyich frequently presented these questions in a particularly sharp form, otherwise the essence of the question would have remained obscure.

The years 1908 to 1911 were not merely years of sojourn abroad, they were years of intense struggle on the most important front—the front of ideological struggle.

*The second period* of the second exile (1911-14) was the period of the revival of the movement in Russia. The growth of the strike movement and the shootings in the Lena gold-fields which called forth the unanimous protest of the whole of the working class, the development of the labour press, the elections to the Duma and the work of the Social-Democratic members in the Duma—all this gave rise to new forms of Party work, created far wider scope for Party work, made the Party more proletarian in membership and brought it nearer to the masses.

Contacts with Russia rapidly began to improve, and great

influence was exercised upon the work in Russia. The Party Conference, held in Prague in January 1912, expelled the liquidators and laid down the organizational principles of the illegal Party. Plekhanov did not join the Bolsheviks.

In 1912 we moved to Cracow. The struggle for the Party and for its consolidation was no longer waged between small groups abroad. In the Cracow period, the Leninist tactics were tested in practice in Russia and proved correct. Lenin became completely absorbed in questions of practical work.

But at the same time that the labour movement was growing in Russia a storm was brewing on the international front. Things began more and more to smack of war, and Ilyich began to ponder over the relationships that would have to be established between the various nations when the impending war was converted into civil war. While living in Cracow, Ilyich had the opportunity of coming into closer contact with the Polish Social-Democrats and of studying their point of view on the national question. He persistently combated their mistakes on this question, and more precisely and definitely formulated his own point of view on it. During the Cracow period the Bolsheviks adopted a series of resolutions on the national question which were of great significance.

*The third period* of the second exile (1914-17) covers the years of the war, when, once again, the whole character of our life abroad underwent a sharp change. This was the period in which international questions assumed decisive importance, in which our Russian affairs could be interpreted only from the point of view of the international movement.

Another foundation, of much wider dimensions, an international foundation, had now to serve as the base for the movement. Everything that could be done in a neutral country was done to carry on propaganda against the imperialist war and to convert this war into civil war and to lay the foundations for a new International. This work absorbed all Lenin's efforts during the first years of the war (the end of 1914 and the whole of 1915).

Influenced by the events going on around him, new ideas occurred to Lenin. He was drawn to a closer and deeper study of the problems of imperialism, of the character of the

war, of the new forms of the state that will arise on the morrow of the victory of the proletariat, of the application of the dialectic method to working-class policy and tactics. We moved from Berne to Zurich where there were better facilities for study. Ilyich gave himself up entirely to writing. He spent whole days in the libraries until news came of the February revolution and we began to make our preparations for departure to Russia.

## II YEARS OF REACTION

GENEVA, 1908

On the evening of our arrival in Geneva, Ilyich wrote a letter to Alexinsky—the Bolshevik deputy in the Second Duma who, together with other Bolshevik deputies had been sentenced to hard labour and who had migrated abroad and was living in Austria at that time—in answer to his letter received in Berlin. A few days later he wrote to Maxim Gorki who had been pressing Ilyich to come to visit him in Italy on the island of Capri.

It was impossible to go to Capri, for it was necessary to start work on the publication of *Proletary*, the illegal central organ of the Party. This had to be done as quickly as possible in order to provide the systematic leadership of the movement in Russia, so essential in those hard times of reaction, through the medium of a central organ. It was impossible to go; but in his letter Ilyich dreamed as it were: "Certainly, it would be important to slip over to Capri!" Then he went on to say: "I think I'd better come to you when you haven't so much work, so that we can lounge about and talk." Ilyich had lived through and thought over so many things in the past few years that he longed for a heart-to-heart talk with Gorki, but he was forced to postpone the trip.

It had not yet been decided whether *Proletary* was to be published in Geneva or in some other place abroad. We wrote to Austria, to the Austrian Social-Democrat, Adler, and to Joseph (Dzerzhinsky),\* who also lived there. Austria was closer to the Russian frontier; in some respects it would have been easier to print the paper there and transportation to Russia would have been easier too. But Ilyich had little

\* A prominent Polish Social-Democrat and Bolshevik. After the October revolution, was head of the U.G.P.U. and later chairman of the Supreme Council of National Economy. Died 1926.—*Ed.*



hope of being able to organise the publication of the paper anywhere but in Geneva, and so he took the necessary measures for starting work in the latter place. To our surprise, we discovered a type-setting machine in Geneva that belonged to us and had been left over from former days. This reduced expenses and simplified matters.

Comrade Vladimirov, the compositor who set the type for *Vperyod* (*Forward*), the Bolshevik paper published in Geneva before the 1905 revolution, turned up. D. M. Kotlyarenko was placed in charge of general business matters. By February all the comrades who had been sent from Russia to organise the publication of the paper—Lenin, Bogdanov and Innokenty (Dubrovinsky)—had assembled in Geneva.

In a letter dated February 2nd, Vladimir Ilyich wrote to Maxim Gorki: "Everything is ready. We will announce publication in a few days. We have put you down as one of our contributors. Drop me a few lines and let me know whether you will be able to contribute something for the first issues (something like 'Notes on Philistinism' in *Novaya Zhizn* (*New Life*) or extracts from the novel you are now writing, etc.)" As far back as 1894, Lenin, in his book *What the Friends of the People Are and How They Fight Against the Social Democrats*, wrote about bourgeois culture and about the philistinism of the petty-bourgeoisie which he profoundly hated and despised. Hence he was particularly pleased with Gorki's articles on philistinism.

To Lunacharsky, who had gone to live with Gorki at Capri, Ilyich wrote: "Scribble me a line to let me know whether you are properly fixed up and whether you are fit for work again."

The editorial board (Lenin, Bogdanov, Innokenty) sent a letter to Trotsky in Vienna inviting him to contribute to the paper, but Trotsky refused. He did not really want to work with the Bolsheviks, but he did not say so openly; he excused himself on the ground that he was too busy.

The worries about shipping the paper to Russia began. We tried to restore the old contacts. In the past we had shipped our literature to Russia by sea via Marseilles. Ilyich thought that now arrangements could be made, to ship the

paper via Capri where Gorki lived. He had written to Maria Fedorovna Andreyeva, Gorki's wife, instructing her to arrange with ship's employees and workers for the shipment of literature to Odessa. He also wrote to Alexinsky asking him to arrange for shipment through Vienna, although he had little hope for success in this quarter. Alexinsky was quite unfitted for such work. We wrote to our "shipping expert," Piatnitsky . . . who in the past had done excellent work in getting literature across the German border. Piatnitsky was in Russia, and by the time he had succeeded in evading the Police, escaping arrest and crossing the frontier to reach us, nearly eight months elapsed. While on the way, he tried to arrange for shipping the paper through Lvov, but was unsuccessful.

He arrived in Geneva in the autumn of 1908. We decided that he should go back to Leipzig, where he had lived previously, to try to pick up old contacts and organize the shipment of the paper across the German frontier as he had done in the past. Alexinsky decided to come to Geneva. His wife, Tatyana Ivanovna, was to help me with the correspondence with Russia. But these were only plans. As for letters, we waited for them more than we received them.

Soon after we arrived in Geneva an incident occurred in connection with the changing of money. In July 1907 a raid was made on the offices of the State Treasury in Erivan Square in Tiflis. When the revolutionary movement was at its height, and the fight against the autocracy was being waged on an extended front, the Bolsheviks admitted the expediency of making raids, or expropriations as they were called, on the State Treasury. Such a raid was made in Tiflis. The money obtained in the Tiflis raid was handed over to the Bolsheviks for revolutionary purposes. But it was impossible to use the money because it consisted of 500 ruble notes which had to be changed. It was impossible to change the notes in Russia because every bank had received a list of the numbers of the notes and watch was being kept. Reaction was rampant; it was necessary to arrange for the escape of revolutionaries who were being tortured in prison; in order to prevent the movement from dying out it was necessary to establish secret printing shops to print

literature, etc. Money was urgently needed. And so a group of comrades organized attempts to change the 500 ruble notes in a number of towns simultaneously. Such an attempt had been made in Geneva only a few days after our arrival. An *agent provocateur* named Zhitomirsky knew about this and took part in it. At that time, of course, no one knew that Zhitomirsky was an *agent provocateur* and everyone had complete confidence in him; but at that time he had already betrayed Comrade Kamo in Berlin. Thanks to Zhitomirsky's treachery Comrade Kamo was caught with a suitcase containing dynamite. He was arrested by the German police and sentenced to a long term of imprisonment. Later, he was handed over to the Russian authorities. This Zhitomirsky warned the police about the attempt that was to be made to change the notes and those engaged in it were arrested. A Lettish comrade, member of the Zurich group, was arrested in Stockholm and Olga Ravich, a member of the Geneva group of our Party, who had recently come from Russia, and Bogdassarian and N. Khodzhamirean were arrested in Munich. In Geneva, N. A. Semashko\* was arrested. A postcard had been sent to one of the arrested men, addressed to his house.

The good Swiss burghers were frightened to death by this incident. The only thing one heard talked about was the Russian "expropriators." They were discussed with horror around the dining-table, in the boarding-house, where Ilyich and I usually dined. When Mikha Tskhakaya, the Caucasian comrade and chairman of the Third Congress of the Party, who lived in Geneva at that time, came to see us for the first time, in his Caucasian costume, his appearance so frightened our landlady, who no doubt thought that he looked the picture of a brigand, that, with a shriek of fright, she slammed the door in his face.

At that time ultra-opportunist views predominated in the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland, and in connection with the arrest of N. A. Semashko the Swiss Social-Democrats declared that their country was the most democratic in

\*After the October Revolution he became Commissar of Public Health.—Ed.

the world, that justice was supreme in their country and that therefore they could not tolerate acts of violence against private property in their territory.

The Russian government demanded extradition of the prisoners. The Swedish Social-Democrats were prepared to intervene, but they demanded that the Zurich group, to which one of the arrested comrades belonged, declare that the lad who was arrested in Stockholm was a Social-Democrat and had lived all the time in Zurich. The Zurich group in which the Mensheviks predominated refused to do this. The Mensheviks also hastened to dissociate themselves from Semashko in the local Berne press, in which they declared that Semashko was not a Social-Democrat and did not represent the Geneva group at the Stuttgart Congress.

The Mensheviks had condemned the Moscow uprising of 1905 ; they were opposed to everything that might frighten the liberal bourgeoisie. They declared that the fact that the bourgeois intelligentsia deserted the revolution in the time of defeat was due not to the class character of the bourgeois intelligentsia, but to the fact that they were terrified by the methods of struggle employed by the Bolsheviks. They strongly condemned the claim of the Bolsheviks that when the revolutionary struggle was at its height, expropriation was a legitimate method of raising funds for revolutionary purposes. They were of the opinion that the Bolsheviks frightened the liberal bourgeoisie away. Hence the Bolsheviks had to be opposed by fair means or foul.

In a letter dated February 26th, 1908, written to Plekhanov, P.B. Axelrod unfolded a plan to discredit the Bolsheviks in the eyes of the foreigners, and to use the money-changing incident for this purpose. He proposed that a report be drawn up which should be translated into German and French and sent to the Management Committee (Vorstand) of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, to Kautsky, Adler, the International Socialist Bureau, to London, etc. Axelrod's letter, which was published many years later (1926) clearly shows how even at that time the paths of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks widely diverged.

As representative of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, Vladimir Ilyich sent an official statement to the Inter-

national Socialist Bureau concerning the arrest of N. A. Semashko. He also wrote to Gorki saying that if he knew Semashko personally from Nizhni he ought to defend him in the Swiss press. Semashko was soon released.

After the revolution, we found it difficult to get accustomed to life in exile again. Vladimir Ilyich spent his days in the library, but in the evenings we did not know what to do with ourselves. We did not feel like sitting in the cold, cheerless room we had rented; we longed to be among people, and every evening we would go to the cinema or to the theatre, although he rarely stayed to the end, but usually left in the middle of the performance and would go wandering somewhere, most often to the lake.

At last, in February, the first issue of *Proletary* was published in Geneva. Vladimir Ilyich's first article in it is characteristic. He wrote :

"We were able to work for long years before the Revolution. It is not for nothing that it was said that we are as hard as granite. The Social-Democrats have built up a proletarian party that will not lose heart at the failure of the first military attack, will not lose its head and will not be drawn into adventurism. This Party is marching towards Socialism without tying its faith to the outcome of this or that period of bourgeois revolutions. This is precisely why it is free from the weaknesses of the bourgeois revolutions. And this proletarian Party is marching to victory."

These words expressed the thoughts that dominated the whole life of Vladimir Ilyich at that time. During the moment of defeat he dreamed of great proletarian victories. He talked about this during our evening walks on the shores of Lake Geneva.

Comrade Adoratsky,\* who was banished from Russia in 1906, and went back at the beginning of 1908, was still in Geneva when we arrived there. He recalls the conversation we had with Ilyich on the character of the next revolution in Russia and that Ilyich expressed the view that this revolution would undoubtedly place power in the hands of the proletariat. Comrade Adoratsky's reminiscences confirm

\* Now head of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in Moscow. — Ed.

the spirit which pervaded the article quoted above and everything else that Lenin said at that time. Ilyich did not doubt for a single moment that the defeat of the proletariat was only temporary.

Comrade Adoratsky also recalls that Vladimir Ilyich made him write a detailed account of the events of 1905, laying particular stress on the lessons that were to be drawn from the questions concerning the arming of the workers, the organisation of fighting detachments, the organisation of insurrection and the seizing of power. Vladimir Ilyich thought it was extremely necessary to study very carefully the experiences of the revolution because, as he said, this experience would be very useful in the future. He would seize upon every one who had taken part in the recent struggle and hold long conversations with them. In his opinion, the task of the Russian working class was: "To safeguard the traditions of the revolutionary struggle which the intelligentsia and the petty bourgeoisie had hastened to renounce; to develop and to strengthen these traditions; to inculcate them into the minds of the broad masses of the people; to carry them over to the next inevitable rise of the democratic movement." "The workers themselves," he wrote, "are spontaneously following precisely this line. They fought in the great October and December battles too passionately; they saw only too clearly that they can change their conditions *only* by means of this direct revolutionary struggle. They now say, or at least they all feel what that textile worker said who wrote in a letter to his trade union paper: 'The employers have taken back all our gains; the foremen are tormenting us as they did before; *but wait; 1905 will come again!*' "

"Wait; 1905 will come again. That is how a worker looks at things. To the workers the year of struggle was an example of *what should be done*. To the intelligentsia and to the renegade middle class, this was a 'mad year,' it was an example of *what should not be done*. To the proletariat, the study and critical analysis of the experiences of the revolution meant learning to apply the methods of struggle employed at that time *more successfully*; to convert this very October strike movement and December armed struggle-

into a broader, more concentrated, more class-conscious struggle."

Ilyich pictured the years ahead as years of preparation for a new attack. It was necessary to take advantage of the "respite" in the revolutionary struggle in order to deepen its content still more.

First of all, it was necessary to work out the line of struggle that was to be pursued in the new conditions of reaction that prevailed. It was necessary to think out the means by which, while keeping the Party underground, it would be possible at the same time to enable it to act openly, to keep the possibility of speaking to the broad masses of workers and peasants from the floor of the Duma. Ilyich realised that many of the Bolsheviks, the so-called Otzovists, were trying to simplify the problem; they wanted at all cost to cling to the forms of struggle that were expedient when the revolution was at its height; but by doing so they were actually deserting the struggle in the face of the difficult conditions of reaction, deserting in the face of the difficulties of adapting the work to the new conditions. Ilyich defined the Otzovists as Left-Liquidators. The most outspoken Otzovist was Alexinsky. Soon after his return to Geneva, relations between him and Ilyich became strained. Ilyich had to deal with him in connection with a whole series of questions and he was more than ever repelled by the cocksure narrow-mindedness of this man. Alexinsky was not in the least concerned with using the Duma, even in the conditions of reaction, as a means of maintaining contact with the broad masses and peasants. Since the Second Duma had been dissolved, he would not be able to speak there any more and so it did not concern him; that was the attitude he took. Against the background of Geneva, the egotistical hooliganism of this person seemed to stand out in great relief and nakedness and yet at that time he was still regarded as a Bolshevik.....

But it was not a matter of Alexinsky alone. It was obvious that the former solidarity of the Bolshevik fraction was gone, that a split was approaching and first of all a split with Bogdanov.

In Russia, a volume entitled *Studies in the Philosophy*

of *Marxism* appeared containing essays by Bogdanov, Lunacharsky, Bazarov, Suvorov, Berman, Yushkevich and Helfond. The aim of these essays was to revise the materialistic philosophy, to revise Marx's materialistic conception of the development of humanity and the conception of the class struggle.

The new philosophy opened the doors to every type of mysticism. During the years of reaction when pessimism was rife among the intelligentsia, the soil was particularly ripe for the spread of revisionism. Obviously, the split was inevitable.

Ilyich was always interested in questions of philosophy. He studied philosophy closely while in exile and knew very well the opinions of Marx, Engels and Plekhanov. He had studied Hegel, Feuerbach and Kant. While still in exile in Siberia he had heated controversies with comrades who were inclined towards Kant, he followed up what was written on the subject of philosophy in the *Neue Zeit* and generally speaking was well grounded in philosophy.

In his letter to Gorki, (February 25th, 1908), Ilyich told the story of his differences with Bogdanov. While still in exile Ilyich had read Bogdanov's book, *The Fundamental Elements of the Historical Conception of Nature*, but the position then held by Bogdanov was merely a transitional one to his later philosophic views. In 1903, when Ilyich and Plekhanov worked together, the latter more than once railed against Bogdanov for his philosophic opinions. In 1904, when Bogdanov's book, *Empirio-Monism* (Part I) appeared, Ilyich flatly declared to Bogdanov that he considered Plekhanov's views right and not Bogdanov's. In his letter to Gorki, Ilyich wrote as follows:

"In the summer and autumn of 1904, Bogdanov and I arrived at a complete agreement as Bolsheviks, and we concluded a tacit *bloc* by which philosophy was tacitly agreed to be a neutral subject. This *bloc* was maintained during the entire period of the revolution and enabled us jointly to carry out the tactics of revolutionary Social-democracy, i.e., Bolshevism, which, I am profoundly convinced, were the only correct tactics to adopt.

"When the revolution was at its height, we had little time



for philosophy. While in prison, in the beginning of 1906, Bogdanov wrote something else, I think it was Part III of his *Empirio-Monism*. In the summer of 1906 he presented me with a copy of this, and I began to study it closely. After having read it, I became unusually annoyed and angry. It became clearer to me than ever that he was taking an exceedingly wrong non-Marxist line. I then wrote to him a 'love-letter'—a letter on philosophy that took up three notebooks. I made it clear to him, that, of course, I was just a *rank-and-file Marxist* in the field of philosophy, but that it was precisely his clear, popularly and excellently written works that completely convinced me that he was wrong and that Plekhanov was right. I showed my notebooks to several friends (Lunacharsky among them) and thought of publishing them with a title: "The Opinions of a Rank-and-File Marxist on Philosophy," but for some reason or another, I did not do so. Now I am sorry I did not publish them immediately.

"Now the *Studies in the Philosophy of Marxism* have appeared. I have read all the essays in this volume, except the one by Suvorov (I am reading that now) and every essay made me furious. I would rather be quartered than agree to contribute to a publication or be a member of a group which propagated ideas like those.

"I was again drawn to the 'Opinions of a Rank-and-File Marxist on Philosophy' and I began to write. While reading the *Studies* I wrote to Alexander Alexandrovich (Bogdanov), giving him my impressions, of course, straight from the shoulder."

That is how Vladimir Ilyich described this affair to Gorki.

By the time the first number of *Proletary* published abroad appeared (February 13th, 1908), the relations between Ilyich and Bogdanov had become extremely strained.

At the end of March Ilyich still considered that philosophical disputes could and should be separated from the political groupings in the Bolshevik fraction. He was of the opinion that philosophical disputes in the fraction would reveal better than anything else that it is impossible to put Bolshevism on the same level as Bogdanov's philosophy.

However, it was becoming clearer every day that the Bolshevik fraction would soon split.

During this difficult period Ilyich became particularly friendly with Innokenty (Dubrovinsky). Until 1905 we had known Innokenty only from hearsay. "Dyadenka" (Lydia Mikhailovna Knipovich) who had met him while in exile in Astrakhan, praised him very highly. He was also praised by the Samaritans (the Krzhizhanovskys), but we had never met him nor had we corresponded with him. Only once, after the Second Congress of the Party when the squabble with the Mensheviks flared up, did we receive a letter from him in which he urged the importance of preserving the unity of the Party. Later he became a member of the conciliatory Central Committee and was arrested together with other members of the Central Committee at Leonid Andreyev's flat.

In 1905 Ilyich saw Innokenty at work. He saw how completely devoted Innokenty was to the revolutionary cause, how he undertook the most dangerous and difficult tasks. The latter explains why Innokenty was never able to be present at Party Congresses; he would invariably get arrested before the Congress was held. Ilyich saw how resolute Innokenty was in the struggle—he had taken part in the Moscow uprising and was in Kronstadt during the uprising there. Innokenty was not a literary man. He would speak at meetings of workers in the factories and his speeches inspired the workers in their struggle. But no one wrote the speeches down, of course. Ilyich prized Innokenty greatly for his fervent devotion to the cause and was very glad when he arrived in Geneva. They had much in common and this drew them together. Both of them attached great importance to the Party and both were of the opinion that a determined struggle had to be waged against the liquidators who argued that the illegal Party ought to be dissolved because it only hindered the work. Both of them prized Plekhanov very highly and were glad that the latter had not joined the liquidators. Both were of the opinion that Plekhanov was right in the field of philosophy, and that it was absolutely necessary to break away from Bogdanov and that the struggle on the philosophic front had now acquired special significance. Ilyich saw that no one understood his trend of thought so well as Innokenty did. Innokenty would come to dine with

us and after dinner they would discuss plans for work and the situation that had arisen. In the evenings they would meet in the Cafe Landold and continue their discussions there. Ilyich infected Innokenty with his "philosophic intoxication" as he called it. All this drew them very closely together. All that time Ilyich became very greatly attached to Innokenty. This was a very difficult period. In Russia the organization was falling to pieces. The police, with the aid of *agents provo auteurs*, caught the most prominent Party workers. It became impossible to organise big meetings and conferences. It was not an easy matter for people who only recently had been prominent in the eyes of the public to go underground. In the spring (April-May) Kamenev and Varsky (a Polish Social-Democrat and intimate friend of Dzerzhinsky, Tyszko and Rosa Luxemburg) were arrested in the street; a few days later Zinoviev and finally, N. A. Rozhkov (a Bolshevik, member of the Central Committee) were arrested. The masses withdrew into their shell as it were. They wanted to think over everything that had occurred; everybody had become tired of general agitation, it no longer satisfied anyone. People readily joined study circles, but there was no one to lead them. This situation created a favourable environment for the growth of Otzovism. The fighting detachments, being left without the leadership of the Party organisation and acting not in connection with the mass struggle but separately from it, became demoralised, and Innokenty had to disentangle more than one complicated case which arose as a consequence.

In order to try and reach an understanding, Gorki invited Vladimir Ilyich to come to Capri, where Bogdanov, Bazarov and others lived at that time, but Ilyich would not go, for he felt that no understanding was possible. In his letter to Gorki of April 16th, he wrote as follows:

"It would be useless and harmful for me to go: *I cannot and will not have anything to do* with people who have set out to propagate unity between scientific socialism and religion. There is no use arguing and it is absurd to upset oneself for nothing."

However, yielding to Gorki's entreaties, Ilyich did go to Capri in May, but he stayed there only a few days. Of

course, no conciliation with Bogdanov's philosophical views took place. Afterwards, Ilyich recalled how he had said to Bogdanov and Bazarov: "We will simply have to separate for two or three years"—and that Maria Fedorovna, Gorki's wife, laughingly called him to order.

There was a big crowd at Gorki's place, much noise and bustle. Many played chess, others went boating. Ilyich said very little about this trip. He spoke mostly about the beauty of the scene and the quality of the local wine, but he was reticent about the discussion on the big questions that took place there. It was too painful a subject for him to talk about.

Ilyich again became immersed in the study of philosophy.

This is how Vladimir Ilyich describes the situation that prevailed at that time in a letter written in the summer of 1908 to Vorovsky, a comrade with whom he had worked on the *Vperyod* and also during the revolution in 1905. Vorovsky lived in Odessa at that time.

"Dear friend: Thanks for your letter. Both your 'suspensions' are wrong. I was not irritable, but the situation is a difficult one. A rupture with Bogdanov is inevitable. The real reason is that he has taken offence at the sharp criticism that was levelled at his philosophical views at lectures (not at meetings of the editorial board). Now Bogdanov is deliberately seeking for points of difference. He and Alexinsky, who is very quarrelsome and with whom I have been obliged to break off all connections, have invented the boycott\*.....They are preparing for a split on empiriomonistic-boycott grounds. The thing will soon flare up. A fight at the next conference is inevitable. A split is quite probable. If the line of the 'Left' and of true "boycottism" prevails, I will leave the fraction immediately. I asked you to come because I thought that your speedy arrival would help us to ease the situation. We absolutely count upon your coming in August (new style) as a delegate to the conference. You must plan your work in such a way that you will be able to go abroad. We will send money to all the Bolsheviks for the journey. To the local organisations give

\* Boycott of the Duma. — *Ed.*

the slogan: Give mandates only to local and genuine workers. We beg you to write for our paper. We can now pay for articles and will pay regularly. Sincerely yours,

"Perhaps you know a publisher who would undertake to publish the book on philosophy that I will write."

At this time, the Bolsheviks were fairly well supplied with funds. Young Nikolai Pavlovich Schmidt, a nephew of Morozov\* and owner of a furniture factory in the Presnya district of Moscow, came over to the side of the workers in 1905 and joined the Bolsheviks. He provided the money to found *Novaya Zhizn* and also provided money for the purpose of procuring arms. He became intimate with the workers and was one of their best friends. The police called Schmidt's factory a "devil's nest." The factory played an important part during the Moscow uprising. Nikolai Pavlovich was arrested. In prison he was subjected to every kind of torture. The police took him to see what had been done to his factory; they took him to see the murdered workers and finally they murdered him in prison. Before he died, he succeeded in informing his friends outside that he was leaving his property to the Bolsheviks.

Elizaveta Pavlovna Schmidt, Nikolai Pavlovich's younger sister, inherited part of her brother's estate, and she, too, decided to give it to the Bolsheviks. But she was not yet of age and in order that she might be able to dispose of her money as she wished, it was decided to arrange a fictitious marriage. Elizaveta Pavlovna went through a form of marriage with Comrade Ignatyev, a member of the fighting detachment who managed to retain his legality, and being his wife officially, she was able, with the consent of her husband, to do what she liked with her legacy. But the marriage was really a fictitious one. Elizaveta Pavlovna was actually the wife of another Bolshevik, Victor Taratuta. The official marriage enabled her to obtain the legacy immediately and the money was handed over to the Bolsheviks. This is why Ilyich was so certain that *Proletary* would pay for articles, and that delegates would get money for their travelling expenses to the conference.

\*A textile magnate.—Ed.

In the summer, Victor Taratuta came to Geneva. He assisted in business matters and carried on the correspondence with other centres abroad in the capacity of secretary of the Foreign Bureau of the Central Committee.

Gradually, contacts with Russia were established; correspondence was resumed. Nevertheless, I still had plenty time on my hands. It seemed that we would have to stay abroad for a long time and so I decided to learn French thoroughly in order to be able to take part in the work of the local Social-Democratic Party. I took the French language course that was organized for foreigners at the Geneva University. I studied the methods of foreign teachers and I not only learned the French language, but also acquired the Swiss ability to work intensely and conscientiously.

Fatigued from work on this book on philosophy, Ilyich would take my French grammars and books on the history of the language and on the study of the peculiarities of the French language, and would lie in bed and read them for hours until his nerves—wrought up by the philosophic disputes—were calmed.

I also began to study the system of education in Geneva, and I realised for the first time what a bourgeois "elementary" school was. I saw how, in excellent buildings, fitted with large, light windows, the children of workers were educated to become docile slaves and observed that in one and the same classroom the teachers would beat and box the ears of workers' children, but never punish the children of the rich. I saw how every independent thought of a child was stifled; learning by rote predominated over everything and the worship of the power of wealth was inculcated in the children. I never imagined that anything of the kind could take place in a democratic country. I would give Ilyich my impressions in detail. He would listen very attentively.

During the first period of exile, until 1905, Ilyich's observations of life abroad were concentrated mainly on the labour movement. He was particularly interested in labour meetings, demonstrations, etc. Such meetings never took place in Russia before Ilyich went abroad for the first time in 1901. After the revolution in 1905, after having experienced

the tremendous upsurge of the labour movement in Russia, the struggles of the Party, the experience of the Duma, and particularly after Soviets of workers deputies had arisen, he not only became interested in the labour movement abroad, but also, and particularly, in what a bourgeois-democratic republic really was like; what role the masses of the workers played in it; how great was the influence of the workers in it, and how great the influence of other parties.

I recalled the half-amazed and half-contemptuous tones in which Ilyich repeated the words of the speech delivered by a Swiss member of Parliament who (in connection with Semashko's arrest) had said that their republic had existed for hundreds of years, and that it could not permit the violation of the rights of property.

The fight for a democratic republic was a point in our programme at that time. Ilyich now realised with particular clarity that a bourgeois democratic republic was perhaps a more subtle instrument than tsarism, but nevertheless an instrument for enslaving the toiling masses. In a democratic republic the authorities do all in their power to imbue the whole of social life with the bourgeois spirit.

It seems to me that had Ilyich not lived through the 1905 revolution and the second period of exile, he would not have been able to write his book, *State and Revolution*.

The discussions which had started on questions of philosophy called for the speedy publication of the book on philosophy which Ilyich had begun to write. He needed some material which he could not get in Geneva. Moreover, the bickering and squabbling that was such a marked feature of life in exile, greatly hampered his work. He decided therefore to go to London and work in the British Museum and to finish his book there.

While Lenin was away, Lunacharsky was announced to deliver a lecture in Geneva. Innokenty attended the lecture and took part in the debate that followed. Ilyich had sent him an outline of his speech to which he, Innokenty, had made certain alterations. He was very nervous before the day the lecture was to take place and would sit in our house day after day surrounded by books, and copying excerpts. He made a very good speech, however, and de-

clared in his own name and in that of Lenin that Bolshevism had nothing in common with Bogdanov's philosophical trend (empirio-monism), and that he and Lenin adhered to dialectical materialism and sided with Plekhanov. Although Lunacharsky delivered the lecture the principal advocate of empirio-criticism at the meeting was Bogdanov who attacked Innokenty very bitterly . . . . This did not disturb Innokenty in the least. When Ilyich returned from London he gave him a detailed account of the debate.

Ilyich was pleased with his visit to London. He had managed to collect the material he required and to work it up. On August 24th, soon after Lenin's return, the meeting of the Central Committee of the Party took place. At this meeting it was decided to hasten the convocation of the Party Conference. Innokenty went to Russia in order to make the necessary preparations. By that time, liquidationism, which had spread to wide sections of the Mensheviks, had already become clearly manifested and was beginning to gather strength. The liquidators wanted to dissolve the Party and its illegal organisation, which in their opinion only led to arrests. They wanted to confine the activities of the Party to purely legal work in trade unions, benefit societies, etc. In the conditions of reaction that then prevailed, this would have meant abandoning all revolutionary activity, abandoning the leadership, the surrender of all positions. On the other hand, in the ranks of the Bolshevik fraction the Ultimatumists and Otzovists went to the other extreme; they not only objected to the Party working in the Duma, but also to working in cultural and educational organisations, in clubs, schools, legal trade unions, workers' insurance societies, etc. They completely abandoned work among the broad masses and ceased to lead them.

Innokenty and Ilyich very often discussed the necessity of combining Party leadership (for the preservation of which it was necessary at all costs to preserve the illegal organisation) with extensive work among the masses. The immediate task ahead was to prepare for the Party Conference. It was agreed that during the campaign for the election of delegates to the conference extensive agitation would be carried on against the liquidators on the Right and the Left.



Innokenty went to Russia to carry out this plan. He settled in St. Petersburg where he organised the work of the Committee of Five of the Central Committee, consisting of himself, Meshkovsky (Goldenberg) the Menshevik M. I. Broido, the representative of the Bund and a Lettish representative. Innokenty organised a bureau of which Golubkov, who later acted as a delegate to the Central Committee of the Party Conference, was a member. Innokenty himself did not succeed in getting to the conference, which took place in December 1908. About two weeks before the conference was to take place, he was arrested at the Warsaw Railway station as he was booking his ticket to go abroad, and was exiled to the Vologda Province.

The police proved to be very well informed about Innokenty's journey to Russia, and no doubt it was Zhitomirsky who kept them informed. Moreover, "Lucy," the wife of Serov, a member of the Second Duma, was brought in to help in the work of the bureau of the Central Committee which Innokenty had organised. Soon after it was discovered that "Lucy" was an *agent provocateur*.

Ilyich completed his book on philosophy\* in September, after Innokenty left for Russia. It was published much later—in May, 1909.

We had completely settled down in Geneva.

My mother arrived and we set up our little household—we rented a small apartment and began housekeeping. On the surface, our life seemed to be running smoothly. Maria Ilyinishna arrived from Russia; other comrades also began to arrive. I remember that Comrade Skrypnik, who at that time was studying the co-operative movement, also arrived. I accompanied Comrade Skrypnik, in the capacity of interpreter, on visits to the Swiss deputy, Sigg (a terrible opportunist) to discuss the co-operative movement, but the results of these interviews were very meagre, for Sigg and Skrypnik approached the question from entirely different angles. Skrypnik's approach was that of a revolutionary; Sigg, however, regarded the movement as nothing more than well-organised "shopkeeping."

\* *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism. Selected Works, Vol. XI. Collected Works, Vol. XIII.*

Zinoviev and Lilina arrived from Russia. Lilina gave birth to a son, and she and Zinoviev settled down in their little household. Kamenev and his family arrived. After St. Petersburg, life in this small, quiet, petty-bourgeois town of Geneva seemed awfully dull. We all longed to move to some big centre. The Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries had already moved to Paris. Ilyich hesitated. In Geneva, he said, the cost of living was not so high, and there were better facilities for studying there. Finally, Lyadov and Zhitomirsky arrived from Paris and began to persuade us to go there. They advanced a number of arguments in support of this: 1. It would be possible to take part in the French movement; 2. Paris is a large city and there would be less spying. The latter argument convinced Ilyich and in the late autumn we moved to Paris.

In Paris we spent the most trying years of exile. Ilyich always looked back upon them with regret. Time and again he would say: "What the devil made us go to Paris?" It was not the devil, but the necessity for beginning the struggle for Marxism, for Leninism, for the Party, in the very centre of Russian exile life. In those years of reaction, that centre was Paris.

## III\*

### PARIS, 1909-10

We started out for Paris in mid-December, 1908. On the 21st, a Party Conference was to take place with the Mensheviks and Vladimir Ilyich was completely absorbed with this. It was necessary to appraise the situation correctly, to straighten out the Party line, to see that the Party remained a class party, the vanguard which even during the most trying times would not become isolated from the rank and file, from the masses, that would help them to overcome all difficulties and organise them for fresh battles. It was necessary to check the liquidators. Contacts with the organisation in Russia were bad. The conference could not hope for any considerable support from the organisations in Russia (the only delegates to come from Russia were two comrades from Moscow, Baturin from the Urals, and, on the second day, Poletaiev, a member of the Third Duma, came from St. Petersburg). The Otzovists organised themselves in a separate group and were very excited. Before the Party Conference was opened, the Mensheviks called a conference in Basle of their groups abroad at which a number of splitting resolutions were passed. The atmosphere was becoming very tense.

Vladimir Ilyich took only a very remote interest in the efforts we were making to fix up our new quarters. He had more important things to think about. We rented an apartment on the outskirts of the city on the Rue Bonier, near the fortifications, a street adjoining the Avenue d'Orleans not far from the Parc Montsouris. The apartment was light and spacious and even had mirrors over the fireplaces. (This was a special feature of the new houses). There was a room for my mother, one for Maria Ilyinishna who had arrived in Paris, one for Vladimir Ilyich and myself and a living room. But this rather luxurious apartment did not at all fit in with our mode of life and the "furniture" we brought

from Geneva. The contempt with which the *concierge* looked upon our white deal tables, common chairs and stools was worth seeing. In our "parlour" we had only a couple of chairs and a small table. It was not cosy by any means.

The household cares immediately fell to my lot. In Geneva household affairs were much simpler; here there seemed to be a lot of red tape about everything. . . . I was a poor housekeeper; Vladimir Ilyich and Innokenty were of a different opinion, but people who were accustomed to real household management were exceedingly critical of my simple methods.

Life was full of turmoil and bustle in Paris. At that time Russian exiles were drawn to Paris from all parts. During this year Ilyich spent little time at home. Our people would sit in the cafes until late in the night, Taratuta particularly liked to frequent the cafes. Little by little, others were drawn into this habit.

The Party Conference took place (Dec., 1908). After heated debates we managed to adopt a common policy. The *Sotsial-Demokrat* was to become the organ of the Party as a whole. At the meeting of the Central Committee which was held after the Conference, a new editorial board was appointed consisting of Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Martov and Markhlevsky. Eight issues of the paper were published during the year. Martov was the only Menshevik on the board and often he would forget his Menshevism. I remember that once Vladimir Ilyich remarked with satisfaction that it was a pleasure to work with Martov, and that he was an exceedingly talented journalist. But this was only until Dan arrived.

Within the Bolshevik fraction, however, the relations with the Otzovists became more and more strained, the latter were very aggressive in their opposition and at the end of February relations were completely broken off with them. For three years before the rupture we had been working hand in hand with Bogdanov and his followers—we did not merely work, but fought side by side. Fighting side by side makes people more intimate than anything else in the world. Besides, no one could imbue others with enthusiasm for

ideals, infect them with his ardour and at the same time bring out the best in them as Vladimir Ilyich could. Every comrade working with Ilyich seemed, as it were, to be possessed of a part of him. Perhaps that is why they felt so closely drawn to him. The conflict within the fraction was nerve-racking. I remember once Ilyich came home after a heated debate with the Otszovists. I could hardly recognise him, his face was so drawn and he could barely speak. We decided that he must take a week's holiday at Nice to get the sun and be away from the noise and strife. He went and came back much the better for it.

It was very difficult to study in Paris. The "Bibliothèque Nationale" was far from where we lived. Vladimir Ilyich would generally cycle there, but riding a bicycle in Paris was not what it was in the suburbs of Geneva. It entailed much effort. Ilyich would get very tired from these rides. The library closed at lunch time. Then there was a lot of bother in getting books from the library. Ilyich railed against the library and against Paris. I wrote to a French professor who in the summer had conducted French courses in Geneva asking him to recommend other good libraries. I received an answer immediately with the necessary information. Ilyich made the rounds of all the libraries recommended, but could not find a suitable one. In the end his bicycle was stolen. He used to leave it under the staircase at the house adjoining the "Bibliothèque Nationale," and paid the *concierge* ten centimes a day for this. When the bicycle was stolen the *concierge* declared that she had not undertaken to watch the bicycle, but merely to allow Ilyich to put it up under the staircase.

One had to be very careful in riding a bicycle in Paris and in the suburbs. Once on his way to Juvisy, Ilyich collided with an automobile. He barely managed to jump clear, but the bicycle was smashed.

Innokenty, who had escaped from Solvychevodsk, arrived. Zhitomirsky very kindly invited him to live with him. Innokenty arrived very sick. On his way to exile the iron fetters which he wore had so chafed the flesh of his legs that deep wounds were caused. Our doctors examined Innokenty's legs and said a lot of wise things but could do nothing. Ilyich

went to consult the French professor Dubouchier, an excellent surgeon who had worked in Odessa during the 1905 revolution. Ilyich was accompanied by Natasha Hopper who had known Dubouchier in Odessa. When Dubouchier heard the queer things our doctors had told Innokenty he burst out laughing and said: "Your physician comrades may be very good revolutionaries, but as doctors they are jackasses!" Ilyich roared with laughter, and on many occasions afterwards repeated the story. However, Innokenty had to have medical treatment for a long time.

Ilyich was very glad that Innokenty had arrived. They were both happy that Plekhanov was beginning to dissociate himself from the liquidators. He had already announced that he was leaving the editorial<sup>\*</sup> board of *Golos Sotsial Demokrata* (*The Voice of the Social-Democrats*), which the liquidators had controlled since 1908. Later on, he withdrew his resignation, but his relations with the liquidators were becoming more strained and on May 26th, 1909, when the first volume of the Menshevik symposium, *The Social Movement in Russia at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century* appeared, which contained an article by Potresov denying the leading role of the proletariat in the bourgeois democratic revolution, Plekhanov definitely resigned from the editorial board of *Golos Sotsial Demokrata*. Both Ilyich and Innokenty still hoped that joint work with Plekhanov would be possible. The younger generation did not feel towards Plekhanov the same way as the older generation of Marxists in whose lives Plekhanov had played a decisive role. Ilyich and Innokenty took the struggle on the philosophic front very much to heart, for both regarded philosophy as a weapon in the struggle. They were of the opinion that philosophy was organically linked up with the question of evaluating all phenomena from the viewpoint of dialectical materialism, with the questions of the practical struggle in every field. Ilyich wrote to Anna Ilyinishna asking her to hurry the publication of his book. It was proposed to call an enlarged meeting<sup>\*</sup> of the editorial board of *Proletary* at

<sup>\*</sup> To which all the contributors and others actually connected with the paper were to be invited in addition to the board.—*Ed.*

which the question was to be raised of completely breaking away from the Otzovists. "The situation is a sad one here." Vladimir Ilyich wrote to his sister Anna Ilyinichna on May 26th, "*Spaltung* (a split) is inevitable; I hope that in about a month and a half I shall be able to give you an exact account of it."

In May, Ilyich's book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* was published. In this book he, as it were, "crossed all the t's and dotted all the i's" of this controversy. In Lenin's opinion the questions of philosophy were closely bound up with the question of the struggle against religion. That is why he delivered a lecture on *Religion and the Working Class* at the *Proletary* Club and wrote an article entitled "The Attitude of the Workers' Party Towards Religion" for No. 45 of the *Proletary* and another article entitled "The Attitude of Classes and Parties Towards Religion" for No. 6 of the *Sotsial Demokrat*.\* These articles, particularly the one in *Proletary*, are applicable to this very day. In these articles Ilyich emphasises the class character of religion and points out that in the hands of the bourgeoisie religion is a means for diverting the masses from the class struggle and for stultifying their minds. The fight on this front, he argues, must not be ignored or under-estimated; but it must not be approached from too simple an angle; the social roots of religion must be revealed, the question must be taken in all its complexity.

Even as a boy of fifteen, Ilyich understood the pernicious character of religion. He then ceased to wear a cross and stopped going to church. In those days this was not so simple a matter as it is now.

Lenin was of the opinion that the more subtle religions, those that were free from obvious absurdities and externally slavish forms, were more pernicious than the rest. Such religions, he thought, were likely to exercise greater influence on people. He regarded god-creating† (attempts to create new religions and new faiths) as of this class.

In June the delegates began to assemble for the enlarged

\* See *Lenin on Religion*. Little Lenin Library, Vol VII.

† "God creators," also "God seekers" the name given to Bogdanov and his followers, Lunacharsky and others.—Ed

meeting of the editorial board of *Proletary*. This enlarged editorial board of *Proletary* was, in fact, the Bolshevik centre, which at that time also included the adherents of *Vperyod* (*Forward*).....

Among those who attended the meeting were Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bogdanov, representatives of the Bolshevik organisations in Russia—Tomsky (St. Petersburg), Shulyatkov (Moscow), Nakoryakov (Urals), members of the Central Committee—Innokenty, Rykov, Goldenberg, Taratuta and Marat (Shantser). Besides these there were also present Skrypnik (Shehur), Liubimov (Mark Zommer), Poletaev (a member of the Third Duma) and Davidov-Golubkov. The meeting lasted from July 4th to 13th.

Resolutions were passed on the Otzovists and Ultimatumists, for Party unity and against the holding of a special Bolshevik Congress. A special question discussed at the meeting was that of the Capri school. Bogdanov realised that the Bolshevik fraction would inevitably break up and he, in anticipation of this, was beginning to select and organise his own fraction. In Capri, Bogdanov, Alexinsky, Gorki and Lunacharsky had organised a Social-Democratic propagandist school for workers. A worker named Vilonov recruited students in Russia for the school, and his instructions were to recruit "strong and reliable" men. After the experiences of the revolution, the workers strongly felt the need for theoretical training; moreover, this was a time when the immediate struggle had died down and there was time for this sort of thing. The workers went to Capri to study, but to everyone who had been in the thick of Party work it was clear that the Capri school would lay the foundations for a new fraction. And so, the enlarged meeting of the editorial board of *Proletary* passed a resolution condemning the organisation of this new fraction. Bogdanov declared that he would not submit to the decision of the meeting and was expelled from the fraction. Krassin came out in his defence. The Bolshevik fraction split.

In the spring, even before the meeting of the editorial board of *Proletary*, Maria Ilyinishna had fallen seriously ill. Ilyich was very much alarmed. Fortunately the disease was checked in time by an operation performed by Dubouchier.



Her convalescence, however, was rather slow. She needed a rest outside of Paris in the country.

The conference put a great strain upon Ilyich, and when it was over it was necessary for him to go to the country for a rest, away from the turmoil and squabbling of emigre life.

Ilyich began to scan the French newspaper for advertisements of cheap boarding houses. He found a boarding house in the village of Bon-Bon in the region of the Seine and the Loire, which only charged 10 francs a day for four persons. We found the place very convenient and lived there about a month.

Ilyich did no work at Bon-Bon and we tried to refrain from discussing Party affairs. We went for walks every day and almost every day cycled to the Clamart forests, fifteen kilometres away. We also observed French ways of life. Most of the guests at our boarding-house were office employees, shop assistants, etc. One was a saleswoman at a fashionable store, who was staying with her husband and daughter. Another was a valet to some Count. It was quite interesting to watch this petty-bourgeois crowd with its strongly marked petty-bourgeois mentality. On the one hand, these people were highly practical, and saw to it that they were well fed, and that everything was made comfortable for them. On the other hand, they all aspired to be regarded as real gentry. Madame Lagourette (this was the name of the saleswoman) was typical of the rest. She was obviously a woman of the world. She had a great fund of suggestive stories which she would relate with great gusto. But that did not prevent her from speaking longingly of the time when she would lead her daughter Marthe to her first communion, how touching that would be, etc., etc. Of course, to a large degree, this mediocrity bored us. It was a good thing that we were able to keep aloof from them and live as we wanted to. On the whole, Ilyich had a good rest at Bon-Bon.

In the autumn we changed our quarters. We moved to an apartment in the same neighbourhood in Rue Marie Rose. We had two rooms and a kitchen—our windows looked out on a garden. Our “living room” was now the kitchen, where all the heart-to-heart talks took place. By spring Vladimir was eager to set to work. He established a certain routine,

as he called it. He would get up at eight o'clock in the morning, go to the Bibliotheque Nationale, return at 2 p.m. He also did a lot of work at home. I tried to keep people away from him. We always had many visitors, crowds upon crowds, especially at this time when, owing to the reaction raging in Russia, and the trying conditions of work, emigration from Russia increased very considerably. People would arrive from Russia and relate with enthusiasm what was going on there, but soon they seemed to wilt. They became submerged in the daily effort to earn a living and the petty worries of life.

At this time the students at the Capri school invited Ilyich to come to Capri to lecture there: Ilyich categorically refused. He explained to them the fractional character of the school and asked them to come to Paris. Within the Capri school, a fractional struggle flared up. In the beginning of November, five students (there were twelve in all) including Vilonov, the organiser of the school, officially declared themselves to be staunch Leninists and were expelled from the school. This incident proved better than anything else how right Lenin was when he pointed to the fractional character of the school. The expelled students came to Paris. I remember the first meeting we had with Vilonov. He began to tell us about his work in Ekaterinoslav. We had frequently received letters from a worker correspondent in Ekaterinoslav, who signed himself "Misha Zavodski." His letters were very interesting and dealt with the most vital questions of Party and factory life. "Do you happen to know Misha Zavodski?" I asked Vilonov. "Why, I am he," he answered. This immediately created a friendly feeling in Ilyich towards Michael and they had a very long talk that day. In the evening of that same day, Ilyich wrote to Gorki as follows: "Dear Alexey Maximich: All this time I have been fully convinced that you and Comrade Michael were the staunchest champions of the new fraction, with whom it would be absurd for me to attempt to speak in a friendly way. To-day I met Comrade Michael for the first time. We had a heart-to-heart talk about affairs and about yourself and I realised that I had been greatly mistaken. By gad! Philosopher Hegel was right: life progresses in contradictions, and living contradic-

tions are much richer, more varied and profound than the human mind can at first grasp. I regarded the school merely as a centre of a new fraction. This proved to be wrong—not in the sense that it is not the centre of a new fraction (the school has been and is such a centre) but in the sense that this is not complete, it is not the whole truth. Subjectively, certain persons were making the school such a centre; objectively, it was such a centre; but in addition to this, it drew from real working-class life real advanced workers." And what an ardent confidence is expressed in the strength of the working class at the end of the letter where Lenin writes that the working class must forge a party out of elements of every kind and every calibre. "No matter what happens," he writes, "an excellent, revolutionary, social-democracy will be forged in Russia much sooner than it seems to us looking at it from the angle of this thrice cursed state of exile; it will be forged much more surely than we imagine, if we are to judge by certain external symptoms and certain incidents. Men like Michael are a guarantee of this."

Five other students of the Capri school arrived with Michael. Among them "Vanya Kazanets" (Pankratov) was the most conspicuous for his activity and straightforwardness. His opposition to the Capri school was more sharply expressed than that of the rest. There were also Lushvin (Pakhon), Kozyrev (Foma), Ustinov (Vasily) and Romanov (Alya Alexinsky). Ilyich delivered a series of lectures to them and devoted a great deal of attention to their studies. Then they left for Russia, except Michael who had tuberculosis, which he had contracted as a result of the harsh treatment he had received in the Nikolayev penal regiment. We placed him in Davos. He did not live there long, however. He died on May 1st, 1910.

At the end of December the studies at Capri came to a close and the rest of the students arrived in Paris. Ilyich delivered lectures to these also. He spoke to them on current topics, about the land reforms introduced in Russia by the then premier Stolypin whose policy was to build up a class of "well-to-do" peasants, about the leading role of the proletariat and about the work of the Social-Democratic deputies in the Duma. Comrade Kozyrev relates that one of

the students tried to trip Ilyich up and make it appear that Ilyich attached more importance to work in the Duma than to carrying on agitation in the army. Ilyich smiled, and went on to talk about the importance of work in the Duma. Of course, he did not for a moment think that the work in the army should be slackened in the least degree, but he did think that this work ought to be carried on more secretly. "This work," he said, "must be done, but not talked about." Just at this time a letter had arrived from Toulon, from a group of sailors, Social-Democrats, on the cruiser *Slava*, asking for literature and particularly for a person to be sent to carry on revolutionary work among the sailors. Ilyich sent a comrade there who had much experience in secret work and this comrade settled in Toulon. Of course, Ilyich did not even as much as hint about this to the students.

Although Lenin's thoughts were almost entirely taken up with Russia, he nevertheless made a careful study of the French labour movement. At that time the Socialist Party of France was opportunistic to the core. For example: In the spring of 1909 a great strike of postal employees broke out. The whole city was in a state of excitement over the event; but the Party kept aloof. "It is the business of the trade unions and not ours," the Party leaders said. To us Russians this division of labour, the Party's aloofness from an economic struggle, seemed positively monstrous.

Ilyich paid particular attention to the election campaign. The campaign did not seem to concern immediate political problems; it was all taken up with personal bickering and mutual abuse. Only a few of the meetings were interesting. At one of them I saw Jaures. He had tremendous influence on the crowd; but I did not like his speech—every word seemed to be deliberately chosen. I liked Vaillant's speech much better. Vaillant had been a fighter in the Paris Commune and was particularly loved and esteemed by the workers. I can recall the figure of a tall worker who had come to the meeting straight from work, with his shirt sleeves rolled up. This man listened to Vaillant with wrapt attention and suddenly he exclaimed: "Fine speaker, the old man!" Two young lads, the sons of this worker, sitting beside him, were equally enthusiastic. But not all the orators

at the meetings were Jaureses and Vailants. The ordinary speakers played down to their audiences: they spoke in one way to a working-class audience and in another way to an audience of intellectuals. By attending French election meetings, we got a clear insight into what elections mean in a "democratic republic." To an outside observer, the thing seemed simply astonishing. That is why Ilyich was so fond of the revolutionary music-hall singers who poured ridicule on the election campaign. . . .

Ilyich was fond of visiting the suburban theatres, and of watching the working-class audiences there. I remember on one occasion we went to see a play which depicted the tortures of soldiers in a penal battalion in Morocco. . . . It ended with a mutiny and the singing of the *Internationale*. The performance of this play was prohibited in the centre of the city; but in the suburbs it was performed to enthusiastic audiences. In 1910 a huge demonstration took place in which about 100,000 persons took part, to protest against the Morocco adventure. The demonstration took place with the sanction of the police. It was headed by Socialist members of the Chamber of Deputies who wore red sashes. The workers were in a fighting mood and shook their fists at the windows of the houses in the wealthy quarters of the town. Here and there shutters were hastily put up; but the demonstration passed off as peacefully as could be. It did not resemble a protest demonstration at all.

Through Charles Rappoport, Vladimir Ilyich was introduced to Paul Lafargue, a son-in-law of Karl Marx, a true and tried fighter of whom Ilyich had a very high opinion. Lafargue and his wife Laura, Marx's daughter, lived in Draveil, about 25 kilometres from Paris. They had already retired from active work. One day, Ilyich and I cycled to Draveil to visit the Lafargues. They received us very amiably. Vladimir began to tell Lafargue about his book on philosophy while Laura Lafargue took me for a walk in the park. I was a little excited—I was actually walking with Marx's daughter. I scanned her face eagerly to try to find some resemblance to Marx in her features. In my embarrassment I babbled something inarticulately about the part women were playing in the revolutionary movement and

about Russia. She replied, but somehow or other conversation lagged. When we returned we found Lafargue and Ilyich discussing philosophy. "Soon he will prove," Laura said about her husband, "how sincere are his philosophic convictions," and she exchanged significant glances with her husband. In 1911, when I learned of the death of the Lafargues, I understood the significance of these words and of this exchange of glances. They both died together as atheists. They committed suicide and left a note saying that they had both decided to die because of their old age, and because they were too feeble to carry on the struggle.

In 1910 an enlarged meeting of the Central Committee of the Party was held. At the enlarged meeting of the editorial board of the *Proletary*, resolutions had been passed in favour of Party unity and against calling a separate Bolshevik Congress. At this meeting of the Central Committee Ilyich and a group of comrades who rallied round him maintained the same line. In the period of reaction it was extremely important to have a party that boldly told the whole truth, even though it was underground. This was a time when the reaction was wrecking the Party, when the Party was becoming submerged in opportunism, when it was important to hold aloft the banner of the Party at all cost. In Russia, the liquidators had their own strong, legal opportunist centre. It was necessary to retain the Party in order to counteract that centre. The experience of the Capri School showed how very often at that time the fractionalism of the workers was relative and peculiar. It was important to have a united Party centre around which the masses of the Social-Democratic workers could rally. The struggle in 1910 was a struggle for the very existence of the Party, for exercising influence upon the workers through the medium of the Party. Vladimir Ilyich was convinced that within the Party the Bolsheviks would be in the majority, that in the end the Party would take the Bolshevik line; but it had to be a party and not a fraction. Ilyich pursued this line also in 1911 when a Party school was being formed near Paris which admitted the followers of *Vperyod* and Party Mensheviks\* as well as

\* i.e. Mensheviks like Plekhanov, who were not liquidators and agreed that the illegal Party should be preserved.—Ed.

Bolsheviks. This line was also pursued at the Prague Party Conference in 1912. Ilyich did not want a fraction but a Party that pursued a Bolshevik line. Of course, in this Party there was no room for liquidators, for the fight against whom forces were being gathered. Of course, there was no room in the Party for those who had decided beforehand that they would not abide by the decisions of the Party. Certain comrades, however, interpreted the fight for the Party to mean conciliation of the liquidators; they lost sight of the purpose of unity and strove to unite everybody irrespective of what their aims were. Even Innokenty, who entirely supported Lenin's point of view, and who considered that the main thing was to unite with the Party Mensheviks, with the Plekhanovists, was so carried away with the desire to preserve the Party that he, too, began to incline towards the conciliatory point of view. Ilyich put him right, however.

On the whole, the resolutions were passed unanimously. It is ridiculous to think that Ilyich was voted down and overwhelmed by the votes of the conciliators and that he surrendered his position. The Plenum lasted three weeks. Ilyich considered that it was necessary to make the utmost possible concessions on organisational questions without yielding an inch of his position on principles. *Proletary*, the organ of the Bolshevik fraction, was closed down. The 500-ruble notes which had not yet been changed were destroyed. The funds of the Bolshevik fraction were handed over to so-called "trustees," three German comrades: Kautsky, Mehring, and Clara Zetkin, who were to pay out the money only for general Party purposes; in the event of a split the balance of the money was to be returned to the Bolsheviks. Kamenev was sent to Vienna as the Bolshevik representative on the Trotskyist *Pravda*. "Things have been very stormy here recently," Lenin wrote to his sister, Anna Ilyinishna, "but it ended in an attempt to make peace with the Mensheviks. Yes, yes, strange as it may appear, we have closed down the organ of the fraction and we are trying to make a strong move towards unity."

Innokenty and Nogin went to Russia to organise a Russian (i.e. working in Russia) collegium of the Central Committee. Nogin was a conciliator who wished to unite everybody and

his speeches met with a rebuff on the part of the Bolsheviks. Innokenty followed a different line; but Russia was not "abroad" where every word uttered was understood: his words were interpreted in the terms of Nogin, all the non-Bolsheviks saw to that. Lindov and V. P. Miliutin were co-opted on the Central Committee. Innokenty was soon arrested. Lindov shared Nogin's point of view, and was not very active. The state of the Russian Central Committee in 1910 could not have been worse.

Abroad, things were not much better. Mark (Liubimov) and Lyova (Vladimirov) were "conciliators in general" and frequently allowed themselves to be influenced by tales about the alleged quarrelsomeness and disloyalty of the Bolsheviks. Mark, particularly, heard many such stories, for he was a member of the United Bureau of the Central Committee Abroad, on which all the fractions were represented.

The *Vperyod*-ists continued to organise their forces. Alexinsky's group once broke into a meeting of a Bolshevik group which had assembled in a cafe on Avenue d'Orleans. With an insolent air Alexinsky sat down at a table and demanded to be allowed to speak, and when this was refused he began to create an uproar. The *Vperyod*-ists who came with him threw themselves upon our comrades to attack them. Abram Skovno and Isaac Krivoy, members of our group, were about to plunge into the fight, but Nikolai Vassilievich Sapozhkov (Kutnetsov), a very powerful man, grabbed him under one arm and Isaac under the other, while the proprietor of the cafe, who had had much experience in the matter of brawls, extinguished the lights. There was no fight. But after this incident Ilyich wandered about the streets of Paris all night and when he returned home he could not fall asleep until morning.

In a letter to Maxim Gorki dated April 11th, 1910, Ilyich wrote: "Well, it seems that the 'ludicrous' is the predominant note in the unity and gives good grounds for sniggering, jokes, etc. It is sickening to have to live amidst this "ludicrousness," amidst this squabbling and scandal. And it is sickening to watch it. But one must not give way to one's moods. The life of an exile now is a hundred times more arduous than it was before the revolution. Exile and squab-



bling are inseparable. But squabbling is a minor thing; nine-tenths of the squabbling remains abroad; squabbling is merely a by-product. But the development of the Party, the development of the Social-Democratic movement is going on and on, in spite of the present hellishly difficult conditions. The purging of the Social-Democratic Party of its dangerous 'deviations,' of its liquidationism and Otzovism is going ahead unswervingly; within the framework of unity it has made considerably more progress than before."

Further on, he writes: "I can imagine how hard it is to watch this difficult growth of a new Social-Democratic movement for those who have not seen and did not experience the difficult growth at the end of the eighties and the beginning of the nineties. At that time Social-Democrats could be counted in tens if not in units. Now they number hundreds and thousands. Hence, crisis after crisis. And Social-Democracy *as a whole* is overcoming these crises openly and honestly."

Sick of the squabbling, a number of the comrades went away. Lozovsky,\* for example, gave himself up entirely to the French trade union movement. We, too, longed to come closer to the French movement. We thought it would be useful for us in this connection if we went to live for a time at the holiday camp organised by the French Party. This camp was situated on the sea shore near the village of Pornic on the famous Vendee coast. First my mother and I went to live there, but we were not happy. The French people kept too much to themselves; each family kept aloof from the others and their attitude towards Russians was somewhat unfriendly. This was particularly the case with the manager of the camp. I became rather friendly with a French teacher. There were hardly any workers at the camp. Soon, the Kostitsins and Savvushka, *Vperyod*-ists, arrived at the camp, and they immediately had a row with the manager. Then we all decided to move to Pornic and board together. My mother and I rented two small rooms from the coast-guard. Soon, Ilyich arrived. He bathed in the sea a great deal,

\* Now (1942) Deputy Commissioner for Foreign Affairs and head of the Soviet Information Bureau.—*Ed.*

cycled—he loved the sea and the sea breezes—and chatted cheerfully on all sorts of subjects with the Kostitsins, enjoyed eating the crabs which the coast-guard caught for us. In fact, our landlord and his wife took a great liking to Ilyich. The stout, loud-voiced landlady—she was a laundress—would tell us about the conflicts she had with the priests. She had a little son who attended the secular school, and since the youngster was a clever and capable boy, the priests had tried to persuade the mother to allow the boy to be educated in the monastery and promised to pay the boy a scholarship; but the laundress indignantly showed the priest the door. She did not give birth to a son, she said, in order to make a despicable Jesuit of him. And this was why Ilyich praised the crabs so highly. Ilyich arrived at Pornic on August 1st, and by the 26th he was already in Copenhagen whither he had gone to attend the meeting of the International Socialist Bureau and the International Socialist Congress. In describing the work of the Congress, Ilyich wrote: "Differences with the revisionists are looming, but the revisionists are still far from a declaration of their own independent programme. The struggle against revisionism has been postponed, but this struggle is inevitable." The Russian delegation at the Congress was a large one—twenty in all: ten Social-Democrats, seven Socialist-Revolutionaries and three trade-union delegates. The Social-democratic group contained representatives of every shade: Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Plekhanov, Varsky, Martov and Martinov. Trotsky, Lunacharsky and Kollontai were also in the delegation with consultative votes.\* During the Congress a conference took place in which Lenin, Plekhanov, Zinoviev and the members of the Third Duma, Poletaev and I. P. Pokrovsky, took part. At this conference it was decided to publish a popular newspaper abroad to be called *Rabochaya Gazeta* (*Workers' Newspaper*). Plekhanov played a diplomatic game; nevertheless, he wrote an article for the first number of the paper entitled "Our Position."

After the Copenhagen Congress, Ilyich went to Stockholm to see his mother and sister, Maria Ilyinishna, and spent ten

\* I.e. the right to speak but not to vote.—Ed.

days there. This was the last time he saw his mother. He had a premonition of that and it was with sad and wistful eyes that he followed the departing steamer. When he returned to Russia seven years later, in 1917, she was already dead.

On his return to Paris, Ilyich related that he had managed to have a good talk with Lunacharsky at the Congress. Ilyich always had a strong liking for Lunacharsky. He was greatly charmed by the latter's talent. However, soon after, an article by Lunacharsky entitled "Tactical Trends in Our Party" appeared in *Le Peuple*, in which he treated all the questions from the Otszovist point of view. Ilyich read the article and said nothing. But later, he wrote an article in reply. Others who attended the International Congress also wrote their opinion on it. Trotsky wrote an unsigned article in *Vorwärts*, in which he severely attacked the Bolsheviks and praised his own Vienna *Pravda*. Plekhanov, Lenin and Varsky sent a protest to *Vorwärts* for publishing this article. As far back as 1903 when Trotsky made his appearance abroad, Plekhanov was already hostile towards him. Before the Second Party Congress they had a serious dispute on the question of publishing a popular newspaper. At the Copenhagen Congress Plekhanov signed without a word a protest against Trotsky's action. In retaliation, Trotsky started a campaign against the *Rabochaya Gazeta*, which the Bolsheviks were beginning to publish. He declared that *Rabochaya Gazeta* was a narrow fractional organ, and also delivered a lecture on this subject at the Vienna Club. As a protest against this, Kamenev resigned from the editorial board of the Trotskyist *Pravda* to which he had been appointed after the January Plenum. The Paris conciliators led by Mark were influenced by Trotsky's campaign, and they, too, began a campaign against *Rabochaya Gazeta*, on the ground that they were fighting factionalism. Ilyich hated this vague conciliationism that was devoid of all principle, conciliation with anybody and everybody, which in his opinion was tantamount to surrendering the position when the battle was at its height.

*Neue Zeit*, No. 50 of 1910, contained an article by Trotsky entitled "Tendencies in the Development of Russian Social-

Democracy," and No. 51 contained an article by Martov on "Russian Discussion and Russian Experience." Vladimir Ilyich replied to these in an article entitled "The Historical Meaning of the Internal Party Struggle in Russia,"\* to publish it. ....

In 1911 Comrade Kamo arrived in Paris. He was the comrade who was arrested in Berlin in 1908 while carrying a valise filled with dynamite. He was kept in a German prison for over eighteen months, and while there he pretended to be insane. In October 1909 he was deported to Russia, and there spent another sixteen months in the Metekh fortress in Tiflis. The prison doctor came to the conclusion that Kamo was hopelessly insane and had him transferred to the Mikhailovsk mental hospital. He escaped from the hospital, stowed away on a ship bound for France, and finally arrived in Paris to talk things over with Ilyich. He was terribly upset when he heard that a rupture had occurred between Ilyich and Bogdanov and Krassin. He was very much attached to all three, besides, he did not understand the situation that had developed during the years he was in prison. Ilyich told him all that had occurred.

Kamo asked me to buy him almonds. He would sit in our kitchen living-room eating almonds as he had done at home and would tell us about his arrest in Berlin, about the way he had simulated insanity, about the sparrows he tamed in prison, etc. Ilyich would listen and feel extremely sorry for this exceedingly brave, childishly naive, warm-hearted man who was capable of performing heroic feats, but who now did not know what work to take up. The proposals he made were fantastic. Ilyich did not contradict him, but carefully brought him back to earth, talked to him, about the necessity of organising the transport of literature, etc. Finally it was decided that Kamo should go to Belgium to have an operation performed on his eyes (he was cross-eyed, and this enabled spies to identify him very easily), and then make his way to the south of Russia and from there to the Caucasus. Examining Kamo's coat, Ilyich asked: "Have you got a warm coat? You will be cold on deck in this one." When-

\* Lenin: "Selected Works," Vol. III. p. 499.

ever Ilyich travelled on a steamer he walked up and down the deck incessantly. When it turned out that Kamo had no other coat, Ilyich took his soft grey cloak which his mother had given him as a present while in Stockholm, and of which he was very fond, and gave it to Kamo. The talk with Ilyich and Ilyich's kindness soothed Kamo. Years after, during the civil war, Kamo again found his "element" and again performed miracles of heroism. It is true that when we adopted the new economic policy he again went off the rails and kept talking about wanting to go to school, dreaming all the while of all kinds of exploits. He died at the time of Ilyich's last illness. He was cycling down the Veryesk slope in Tiflis, ran into an automobile and was killed.

In 1910 Inessa Armand arrived from Brussels and immediately became an active member of our Paris group. Together with Semashko and Brittman (Kazakov) she joined the committee of the group and began to carry on extensive correspondence with other groups abroad. She had two little children, a boy and girl. She was a very ardent Bolshevik and soon gathered our Paris crowd around her.

On the whole, our Paris group began to grow and gained strength. Ideologically, we also became stronger. The only trouble was that we were so poor. Workers managed to eke out a livelihood somehow or other, but the conditions of the intellectuals were very bad. It was not always possible to become a worker. To live at the expense of the exiles' funds and to feed in the exiles' dining-room was humiliating. I remember several sad cases. One comrade tried to become a French polisher, but it was not easy to learn the trade, and he was forced to change his jobs frequently. He lived in a working-class district far from where the other exiles lived. At last he became so weak from lack of food that he could not leave his bed and wrote to us asking for money. He asked, however, that it should not be brought directly to him but left with the concierge.

Nikolai Vasilievich Sapozhkov (Kuznetsov) had a hard time. He and his wife found work at painting pottery, but they earned very little and one could see this giant of a man positively withering away; his face became furrowed with

wrinkles as a result of slow starvation, although he never complained of his condition. There were many cases like that....

To have lived another year or two in this atmosphere would have been fatal. But the years of reaction gave way to years of revival of the revolutionary movement.

In connection with the death of Tolstoy, demonstrations were organised in Russia. The first issue of *Zvezda* (*The Star*) was published, in Moscow the *Bolshevik Mysl* (*Thought*) began to appear. Ilyich immediately revived. His article: "The Beginning of Demonstrations,"\* written on December 31st, 1910, breathes inexhaustible energy. It ends up with the invocation: "To work, comrades! Begin everywhere to build up your organisations, to create and strengthen Social-Democratic workers' cells, to develop economic and political agitation. In the first Russian revolution the proletariat taught the masses of the people to fight for liberty; in the second revolution it must lead them to victory."

\*See Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol IV, p. 389.

IV  
THE YEARS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY REVIVAL.  
(1911-14)

PARIS, 1911-12

The end of 1910 was marked by the revolutionary revival. The years from 1911 to 1914 were years in which, right up to the beginning of the war in August 1914, every month saw an increase in the strength of the labour movement. But this movement was now growing under conditions entirely different from those in which the labour movement grew before 1905. It was developing on the basis of the experiences of the 1905 revolution. It was not the same proletariat. The proletariat had gone through a great deal—a wave of strikes, a number of armed uprisings, a tremendous mass movement; and it had experienced years of defeat. That made all the difference. This was reflected in everything, and Ilyich, who flung himself with all his ardour into the maelstrom of life and was able to discern the significance of and weigh every phase uttered by the workers, felt this growth of the proletariat in every fibre of his being. On the other hand, he knew that it was not only the proletariat but conditions as a whole that had changed. The intelligentsia, too, had changed. In 1905, broad strata of the intelligentsia supported the workers. Now it was different. The character of the struggle that was to be led by the proletariat had already become defined. The struggle would be fierce, irreconcilable; the proletariat would destroy everything that stood in its way. The liberal bourgeoisie would no longer be able to use the workers as a tool for the purpose of winning for itself the limited Constitution that it wanted. The working class would not be content with a limited Constitution. The working class would not be led; it would lead. And the conditions of the struggle changed, too. The tsarist government had also learned the lessons of the 1905 revolution. It had now enmeshed the entire labour organisation with a network of *agents provocateurs*. These were not

the old type of spies who used to hang around street corners, and from whom it was possible to hide. These were the Malinovskys, Romanovs, the Brendinskys, the Chernomazovs, who had managed to penetrate into the Party and occupy responsible positions in it. The spying and arrests were no longer haphazard; they were carefully planned.

These conditions served as a regular breeding-ground for opportunism of the worst kind. The policy of the liquidators to dissolve the Party, the vanguard of the working class, was supported by the broad strata of the intelligentsia. Liquidators sprang up right and left like mushrooms. Every insignificant Cadet,\* tried to throw mud at the illegal Party. It was impossible not to carry on a fierce struggle against them. The struggle, however, was an unequal one. The liquidators had a strong legal centre in Russia and were able to carry on extensive work in favour of their policy among the masses. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, had to fight for every inch of the ground, under the very trying conditions of underground work which then prevailed.

The year 1911 started with a break through the censorship on the one hand and an energetic struggle for the strengthening of the illegal Party organisation on the other. The fight began inside the united organisation abroad which was created at the conference of January 1910; but soon it extended beyond the limits of this organisation and pursued its own course. Ilyich was overjoyed at the publication of *Zvezda* in St. Petersburg and *Mysl* in Moscow. The organisation of the shipment to Russia of the newspapers published abroad was very bad indeed, worse than it was before 1905. Russia and the foreign countries were teeming with *agents provocateurs*, who managed to get on the track of everything. Hence Ilyich's joy at the publication in Russia of legal newspapers and magazines to which Bolsheviks could contribute.

The editorial board of *Zvezda* consisted of Bonch-Bruевич (Bolshevik), N. Jordansky (a follower of Plekhanov at that time) and I. P. Pokrovsky (a member of the Duma who sympathised with the Bolsheviks). The newspaper was the

\* Abbreviation of the term Constitutional Democrat, i.e. bourgeois liberal —*Ed.*



organ of the Social-Democratic Party in the Duma.\* The first issue contained an article by Plekhanov. Vladimir Ilyich was not quite satisfied with the first issue, it appeared dull to him. But he was very pleased with the first issue of the *Moscow Mysl*.

Writing to Maxim Gorki about the paper, he said: "it is entirely ours and it pleases me greatly." Ilyich began to write a great deal for *Zvezda* and *Mysl*. It was not an easy task to publish legal newspapers at that time. In February Skvortsov-Stepanov was arrested in Moscow, and in St. Petersburg Bonch-Bruевич, Lydia Mikhailovna Knipovich, who worked with Poletaev, and others were arrested. In April *Mysl* was completely closed down and in June, *Zvezda*, the organ of the Duma fraction, was also discontinued after twenty-five numbers had been published. It did not resume publication until November 5th. It then became a definitely Bolshevik paper. In Baku another Bolshevik paper *Sovremennaya Zhizn* (*Contemporary Life*) also began to be published.

In July negotiations with Comrade Savelyev commenced for the publication of a legal magazine *Prosveshchenie* (*Education*) in St. Petersburg, but we succeeded in publishing this magazine only at the end of 1911.

Vladimir Ilyich watched these publications very closely and wrote for them. . . .

In November, 1910, the Otzovists organised a school in Bologna, Italy. The students invited a number of lecturers to lecture to them. Among these were Dan, Plekhanov and Lenin. Vladimir Ilyich refused to go to Bologna but asked the students to come to Paris. The *Vperyod*-ists, having learned from the experience of the Capri school, began to hedge; they demanded an official invitation from the Bureau of the Central Committee abroad in which the Mensheviks predominated at that time. And when they arrived in Paris together with the students who were to counteract Lenin's influence, they demanded autonomy. However, no studies were organised and the bureau sent the students back to Russia.

\* Referred to as the Duma fraction.—Ed.

In the spring of 1911 we at last succeeded in establishing our own Party school near Paris. This school was open to Bolshevik workers and Party Menshevik and *Vperyod*-ist (Otzovist) workers. The two latter groups, however, were a small minority.

The first to arrive at the school were comrades from St. Petersburg—two metal workers—Belostotsky (Vladimir) and George (I cannot recall his surname), a *Vperyod*-ist, and a woman-worker named Vera Vasilyeva. They were an intelligent group and quite advanced. On the first evening of their arrival Ilyich took them to a cafe for supper and I remember how fervently he talked to them the whole evening, asking them about St. Petersburg, about their work, and trying to detect in their answers symptoms of the revival of the labour movement in Russia. Nicolai Alexandrovich Semashko got them temporarily fixed up in Fontenay-aux-Roses, a suburb of Paris, not far from where he lived. While waiting until the other students arrived they spent their time reading; later, two comrades arrived from Moscow: Prisyagin, a tanner by trade, and a textile worker whose name I do not remember. The St. Petersburg comrades soon became fast friends with Prisyagin. He was a worker above the average level of intelligence and had edited the illegal journal of the leather workers in Russia. He wrote well, but he was very shy. His hands would tremble with nervousness when he talked. Belostotsky teased him for this, very mildly and good naturedly.

During the October revolution, Prisyagin was chairman of the Provincial Council of Trade Unions in Barnaul, in Siberia. He was caught and shot by Kólehak when the latter captured the city. . . .

We decided to organise the school in the village of Longjumeau, 15 kilometres from Paris, where there were no Russians and no summer visitors. Longjumeau was a straggling French village stretching along the highroad over which cartloads of farmers' produce rumbled all night carrying food to fill "the belly of Paris." There was a small tannery in the village, situated in a field surrounded by orchards. Our plan was the following. The students were to rent rooms in the village. Inessa was to rent a whole

house in which a dining-room was to be organised for the students. We and the Zinovievs also moved to Longjumeau. Katya Mazonova, the wife of a worker who had been in exile with Martov in Turukhansk in Siberia, and later had worked illegally in the Urals, undertook to keep house. Katya was a good housekeeper and a good comrade. Everything went off splendidly. In the house which Inessa rented we placed Sergo (Ordjonikidze),\* Semyon (Schwartz) and Zakhar (Breslav). Sergo had arrived in Paris a little before. Until then he had lived in Persia and I remember the detailed correspondence we carried on with him concerning the line which Ilyich pursued in relation to the Plekhanovists, the liquidators and the *Vperyod*-ists. We always maintained regular correspondence with the Caucasian Bolshevik group. We had written to Sergo giving the details of the struggle that was raging abroad and for a long time we received no reply. One day the concierge came in to me and said: "There's a man downstairs who doesn't speak a word of French; he must be looking for you." I went downstairs and saw a smiling Caucasian standing in the hall. It proved to be Sergo. From that time on he became one of our most intimate comrades. Semyon Schwartz we had known for a long time. My mother liked him particularly well because he would relate in her presence how, when a lad of nineteen, he distributed leaflets in a factory for the first time. He was a worker from Nikolayev. While distributing the leaflets, he pretended to be drunk, he said. Breslav we had known since 1905 in St. Petersburg.

Thus, Inessa's house was entirely occupied by our own people. We lived at the other end of the village, and would take our dinner in the communal dining-room, where it was pleasant to chat with the students, question them on various topics and discuss current events with them.

We rented a couple of rooms in a small, two-story, brick house (in Longjumeau all the houses were built of brick), from a worker employed at the tannery, and this gave us an opportunity to observe the life of a worker employed in a small enterprise. This

\* Died 1937 as Commissar for Heavy Industries in the U.S.S.R.—Ed.

man would go to work early in the morning and come back in the evening completely exhausted. There was no garden attached to this house. Sometimes, he would bring a table and a chair out into the street, and would sit for hours resting his tired head on his exhausted arms. None of his fellow workers ever visited him. On Sundays he would go to church. . . . Nuns with beautiful operatic voices would come to sing there; they would sing the compositions of Beethoven and others and it is not surprising that the tanner, whose life was so drab, should have been enraptured with the music. We could not help comparing him with Prisyagin who was also a tanner by trade and whose life was not much easier than that of the Longjumeau tanner; but he was a class-conscious fighter, and a favourite among his comrades. The wife of the French tanner would put on her wooden shoes early in the morning, take her broom and go to the neighbouring chateau where she was employed as a charwoman. Her young daughter would remain at home to look after the house. All day long she would stay in the gloomy, damp house, taking care of her younger brothers and sisters. She did not appear to have any girl friends. Her life was just one round of household drudgery on week-days and of visits to the church on Sundays and holidays. It never occurred to any of the members of the tanner's family that any change was required in the social system. Why, God created the rich and the poor, then things must be so—reasoned the tanner. . . .

Soon all the students were assembled, Andreyev, a worker from Nikolayev, who, while in exile, I think in Vologda, passed through a special course of study. Ilyich would jestingly call him his best student. Then there was Dogadov (Pavel) from Baku, and Sema (Semkov). Two arrived from Kiev: Andrey Malinovsky and Chugurin. These two were Plekhanovists. Later we discovered that Malinovsky was an *agent provocateur*. He was not distinguished in any way except that he had a beautiful voice. He was quite a young fellow and not very observant. He told me how he had eluded the police while on his way to Paris. His story did not seem very plausible to me, but it did not arouse any particular suspicion. The other man, Chugurin, regarded

himself as a Plekhanovist. He was a worker employed at the Sormova works and had served a long term of imprisonment. He was a very intelligent worker, but rather highly strung. He soon became a Bolshevik. Savva (Zevin) also a Plekhanovist, came from Ekaterinoslav. When renting rooms for the students we said that they were Russian village teachers. During his stay at Longjumeau, Savva fell sick with typhus. The French doctor who visited him said smilingly: "What strange teachers you have." The thing that surprised the French people most was that our "teachers" would walk around all day barefooted. (It was unbearably hot that summer.)

Six months later Zevin attended the Paris Party Conference. He fought in the ranks of the Bolsheviks for many years until his tragic death. He was one of the twenty-six Baku Commissars who were shot by the White Guards in 1918. . . .

Studies went on very regularly. Ilyich delivered lectures on political economy (thirty lectures), on the agrarian question (ten lectures), and on the theory and practice of socialism (five lectures). Inessa worked as a tutor on political economy. Zinoviev and Kamenev lectured on the history of the Party and Semashko also delivered several lectures. There were several other lecturers, among whom were Riazanov, who lectured on the history of the labour movement in western Europe, Charles Rappoport who lectured on the French labour movement, Steklov and Finn-Yenotaevsky lectured on public law and finance, Lunacharsky on literature, and Stanislav Volsky on journalism.

The students worked very hard, but some evenings they would go out into the field where they would sing or lie near a haystack and talk about all sorts of things. Ilyich would sometimes accompany them.

Kamenev did not live in Longjumeau and would come there only to deliver his lectures. At that time he was writing his book *Two Parties*. He would often discuss this with Ilyich. They would lie on the grass in the meadow on the outskirts of the village and Ilyich would expound his ideas. Ilyich wrote a preface to this book.

I had to go to Paris frequently to see our people on business. This was necessary in order to save them coming to

Longjumeau. The students were preparing to go back to work in Russia, and it was necessary to keep their stay near Paris as secret as possible. Ilyich was very pleased with the work of the school. In our spare time we usually went cycling. We would walk up the hill and then ride out for about fifteen kilometres to a place where there was an aerodrome. This was a secluded place and much less frequented than the aerodrome at Juvisy. Often we were the only visitors and Ilyich was able to watch the manoeuvres of the aeroplanes to his heart's content.

In the middle of August we moved back to Paris.

The unity of all the fractions, which was achieved with so much difficulty in 1910, gradually began to break up.\* As the practical problems of the work in Russia arose it became more and more clear that joint work was impossible. The requirements of practical work tore away the mask that some of the Mensheviks wore. The real meaning of Trotsky's "loyalty" was revealed. Behind the mask of loyalty he tried to unite the liquidators and the *Vperyod*-ists. When it became necessary to improve the work of the organisations in Russia the artificiality of this unity immediately became revealed. At the end of December 1910, Lenin, Zinoviev and Kamenev had submitted a proposal to the Bureau of the Central Committee abroad urging the necessity of convening a Plenum of the Central Committee. More than a month passed before they received a reply. The Menshevik Bureau of the Central Committee abroad rejected the proposal. Negotiations on this subject dragged on until the end of May 1911. It became obvious that no good would come out of the Bureau. Comrade Semashko, who was the Bolshevik representative on the Bureau, resigned and the Bolsheviks convened a Conference of the members of the Central Committee who were abroad at that time. In June 1911 there were nine members of the Central Committee abroad. All except the Bundist, Iyonov, who was sick, assembled on June 10th, but the Menshevik Goriev and the Bundist leader left the conference. Those who remained discussed the most pressing questions confronting the Party and also the question of convening a Party Conference. It was decided to set up an organisation committee in Russia, the

function of which was to make arrangements for the Party Conference. In August the comrades left for Russia. Breslav (Zakhar) went to St. Petersburg and Moscow, Semyon (Schwartz) went to the Urals and to Ekaterinoslav, and Sergo went to the south. Rykov also went to Russia, but was arrested in the street immediately on his arrival. It was reported in the newspapers that many addresses were found on him. This was not the case, however. True, a number of Bolsheviks were arrested at the same time, among these being Presyagin, who had just returned to Russia; but later this matter was cleared up. It appeared that in Leipzig, where Piatnitsky was working at that time on shipping literature to Russia and where Rykov stopped before his departure for Russia, there lived a certain Brendinsky, who transported the literature, in whom Piatnitsky and Mark had complete confidence. Later it was discovered that this Brendinsky was an *agent provocateur*. He coded the addresses for Rykov. This explains why the police were in possession of all the addresses although nothing was taken from Rykov when he was searched.

A conference was called in Baku. It was by mere accident that this conference was not raided by the police, because one of the delegates of the conference, the well-known Baku worker Stepan Shaumyan, was arrested together with a number of other Baku workers. The conference was transferred to Tiflis, where it was carried through successfully. Representatives were present from five organisations. Schwartz, Sergo and others were present. Bolsheviks and Plekhanovists were represented. Chernomazov who, later on, was proved to be an *agent provocateur*, was also there; but the Organisation Committee in Russia managed to complete its work—a Party conference was called in January 1912.

In 1911 the Bolshevik group in Paris was quite a strong organisation. It included Comrades Semashko, Vladimirsky, Antonov (Brittman), Kuznetsov (Sopozhkov), the Belinkys (Abram and his brother Grisha), Inessa, Stahl, Natasha Hopner, Kotlyarenko, Chernov (I do not remember his real name), Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Levina, Taratuta, Mark (Liubimov), Lyova (Vladimirov), and others. In all, it had

a membership of over forty. Taken as a whole, this group had considerable connection with Russia and much revolutionary experience.

The struggle against the liquidators, the Trotskyists and other opponents had hardened the group. It did a great deal to help the work in Russia, carried on a certain amount of work among the French workers, and among the masses of the emigrant Russian workers. There were quite a large number of these in Paris. At one time Comrade Stahl and I tried to carry on some work among the masses of foreign women workers—milliners, dressmakers, etc. We organised a number of meetings, but the importance of this work was not fully appreciated by our comrades and this was a great hindrance. At every meeting of the group someone would invariably raise a "racket": "Why call a woman's meeting?" they would say. And so the work petered out, although much good could have been done. Ilyich considered this work to be necessary.

At the end of September, Vladimir Ilyich went to Zurich to attend a conference of the International Socialist Bureau. At this meeting Molkenburg's letter to the Central Committee of the German Social-Democratic Party was discussed. In this letter Molkenburg averred that in view of the forthcoming elections, it would be inexpedient to criticise the German government's colonial policy in connection with the Morocco incidents. Rosa Luxemburg had secured a copy of this letter and published it. Bebel was indignant with her over this. Vladimir Ilyich defended Rosa. The opportunist policy pursued by the German Social-Democrats became clearly revealed at this meeting.

During this trip, Ilyich delivered a number of lectures in Switzerland.

In October the Lafargues committed suicide. Their death made a deep impression upon Ilyich. We recalled our visits to them. Ilyich said: "If one cannot work for the Party any longer, one must be able to look truth in the face and die like the Lafargues." And he felt a desire to say over their biers that their work had not been in vain; that the cause that they initiated, the cause of Marx, with which Paul and Laura Lafargue had been so closely associated, would grow



and spread even to remote Asia. Just at that time the tide of revolution was rising in China. Vladimir Ilyich wrote out the speech and Inessa translated it. I remember with what deep emotion he delivered the speech at the funeral, in the name of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

On the eve of the new year, the Bolsheviks called a conference of the Bolshevik groups abroad. Everyone was in good spirits, although life abroad had frayed everyone's nerves considerably.

### BEGINNING OF 1912

Intensive preparations for the conference were being made. Vladimir Ilyich wrote to Nemetz, the Czech representative on the International Socialist Bureau, asking whether it would be possible to hold the conference in Prague. Prague was desirable because there was no Russian colony there and, besides, Vladimir Ilyich knew Prague, for he had lived there in Modraczek's house in the period of his first exile..... Vladimir Ilyich had already gone to Prague when Philip (Goloshchyokin) and Brendinsky arrived to go together to the conference. I knew Brendinsky only by name as a transporter of literature. He lived in Vilna, where Goloshchyokin also lived. His main function was to dispatch the literature received to the organisations, primarily to Moscow. He was registered on a false passport. Philip related that two weeks before the conference Brendinsky had been arrested, that he was released after about ten days without any charge being brought against him, but that while he was in prison several people came to visit him who were afterwards arrested. He could not say exactly who it was that was arrested. I asked Philip to bring Brendinsky to me, but in the meantime not to tell him where the conference was to take place. The conversation with Brendinsky was a very strange one. We kept receiving word from Piatnitsky that the literature was being safely transported and delivered to Moscow and yet the comrades in Moscow were complaining that they were not receiving anything. The literature was addressed to Brendinsky, and so I asked him whether he could explain what became of this literature. He said that he had not delivered the literature to the organisation because it was

very dangerous to do so, but that he had delivered it to some workers who were friends of his. I then asked him to give me their names. He mentioned several names but it was obvious that he had chosen them at random. He said that he did not remember their addresses. I began to question him about his journeys to various cities. I asked him something about a certain city, Yaroslav. He replied that he could not go there because he had been arrested there. "On what charge?" I asked. He answered, "On a criminal charge." I was dumbfounded. His answers became more and more confused. I then told him that the conference would be held in Brittany and that Ilyich and Zinoviev had already left for that place. Then Philip and I arranged that he should go with Zinoviev to Prague that night and leave a note for Brendinsky, saying that he had left for Brittany.

Later, Brendinsky's "artistry" was completely exposed. He never returned to Russia. The tsarist government bought him a villa in the suburbs of Paris for 40,000 francs.

I was very proud of the fact that I had saved the conference from an *agent provocateur*. I did not know, however, that there were two other *agents provocateurs* at the Prague conference, namely, Roman Malinovsky and Romanov (Alia Alexinsky, formerly a Capri student).

The Prague Conference was the first Party conference with workers from Russia that we succeeded in calling after 1908 and the first at which questions relating to the work in Russia were discussed in a businesslike manner and a definite line for this work drawn up. Resolutions were passed on the current situation and the tasks of the Party, on the elections to the Fourth Duma, on the work of the Social-Democratic fraction in the Duma, on the character and organisational forms of Party work, on the tasks of the Social-Democrats in the struggle against the famine which then raged in Russia, on the State Insurance for Workers' Bill that was before the Duma and on the petition campaign.\*

\* A campaign organised by the liquidators and by Trotsky's organ. *Pravda* in December 1910, for collecting signatures for a petition to the "representatives of the people" in the Third Duma in favour of freedom of association for the workers.—Ed.

A definite Party line on the questions of work in Russia; real leadership of *practical* work—these were the results of the Prague conference.

That is why the Prague conference was such an important one.\* At the conference a Central Committee was elected which included Lenin, Zinoviev, Ordjonikidze (Sergo), Schwartzman (David), Goloshchyokin (Philip), Spandarian and Malinovsky. Substitutes were appointed who were to act, should any of the members be arrested. Soon after the conference, Stalin and Belostotsky (a student at the Longjumeau school) were co-opted to the Central Committee and so unity was established in the Central Committee without which it would have been impossible to carry on, the work during this trying time. The conference undoubtedly marked a great step forward; it checked the disintegration of the work in Russia. Relatively little importance was attached to the abusive attacks of the liquidators, to Trotsky, to Plekhanov's diplomacy, to the Bundists, etc. Although all these called for sharp resistance and exposure, they did not loom so large at this conference as at others. Attention was concentrated on the work in Russia. The misfortune was that Malinovsky was on the Central Committee, and all the details of the conference held with the representatives of the Third Duma, Poletaev and Shurkanov, in Leipzig after the Prague conference, were also known to the police. Shurkanov, too, proved to be an *agent provocateur*. Undoubtedly, the *agent provocateurs* sealed the fate of a number of Party workers and weakened the organisation; but the police were powerless to check the rise of the labour movement. The correct line laid down guided the movement into the right channel and created new forces in increasing number.

Ilyich went to Leipzig to confer with Poletaev and Shurkanov; after this he left for Berlin in order to obtain from the "trustees" the money they were holding and which was so greatly needed now for the work. Meanwhile Shotman came

\* For a fuller account of the Prague Conference see *History of the C. P. S. U. (B)* pp. 138-143, and *Selected Works*. Vol. IV, pp. 149-154. Its chief importance lies in the fact that by its expulsion of the Mensheviks it constituted formally the Party of a new type, the bolshevik Party.—Ed.

to visit us in Paris. He had been working in Finland just before that. The Prague Conference had passed a resolution strongly condemning the policy of the tsarist government and of the Third Duma towards Finland, and emphasising the need for unity between the Finnish and Russian workers in the struggle against tsarism and the Russian counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. Our illegal organisation was working in Finland at that time. Work was being carried on among the sailors in the Baltic Fleet. Shotman arrived to inform us that in Finland everything was ready for rebellion, that the illegal organisation working among the Russian troops was ready for battle (they were planning to seize the Sveaborg and Kronstadt fortresses). Ilyich had not yet returned. When he arrived, he questioned Shotman closely about the organisation, the existence of which was an interesting fact in itself (among the comrades working in the organisation were Rakhya, S.V. Vorobyev, and Kokko). He pointed out, however, that it was inexpedient to start a rebellion at that moment. It was very doubtful, he said, whether the St. Petersburg workers would support a rebellion just then. However, things never reached the stage of rebellion. The organisation was discovered by the authorities, wholesale arrests took place and fifty-two persons were tried on the charge of conspiring to mutiny. Things were very remote from rebellion, of course, but the shootings in the Lena goldfields which occurred in the middle of April, and the strikes that broke out all over the country in protest against this outrage clearly revealed to what an extent the proletariat had developed during these years, revealed that the workers had forgotten nothing, that the movement was rising to a higher stage, that entirely new conditions of work were arising.

Ilyich became another person, he became less irritable, he concentrated more, pondered more on the tasks which had arisen before the Russian labour movement—I should say that his mood at that time was best expressed in the article he wrote in memory of Hertzen in the beginning of May. In it he seemed to convey so much of himself, his ardent passion which fascinated and gripped one so. He wrote: "In honouring the memory of Hertzen, we clearly see three generations, the three classes which have been active in the Russian revo-

lution. First—the nobility and landlords, the Decembrists and Herten. This group of revolutionaries was a restricted one. They were frightfully remote from the people. But the cause for which they fought was not lost. The Decembrists roused Herten. Herten developed revolutionary agitation.

"This agitation was taken up, broadened, strengthened, and steeled by the revolutionary 'rasnochintso,\* beginning with Chernishevsky and ending with the heroes of the *Norodnaya Volya* (*Peoples' Will*). The circle of these fighters broadened and their contacts with the people became more intimate. Herten called them 'young pilots in the coming storm.' That was not yet the real storm.

"The storm—that is the movement of the masses themselves. The proletariat, the only really consistent revolutionary class, rose and became the leader of the masses and for the first time roused millions of peasants for the open revolutionary struggle. The storm first broke in 1905. Its second outburst is developing before our very eyes."

Only a few months before that, Vladimir Ilyich had said to Anna Ilyinishna, who had arrived in Paris: "I do not know whether I will live to see the next rise of the tide." But now, he sensed the gathering storm, the movement of the masses themselves, with every fibre of his being.

When the first number of *Pravda* came out we began to make preparations to move to Cracow. Cracow was in many respects more convenient than Paris. It was more convenient in regard to the police. The French police assisted the Russian police in every possible way. The Polish police, however, was hostile to the Russian police as it was in fact to the whole of the Russian government. In Cracow we could be sure that our letters would not be intercepted and that no one would spy on newcomers. Moreover, the Russian frontier was very close and it was easier to get to and from Russia. Letters and parcels could be sent to Russia without trouble. We hurriedly made preparations to depart. Vladimir Ilyich became quite jolly and particu-

\*Those middle-class elements of the intelligentsia who did not belong to any of the officially recognised "estates."

larly solicitous for the welfare of the comrades who were to remain behind. Crowds and crowds of people came to see us. . . .

We sublet our apartment to a Pole, a Cracow precentor, who took the apartment with the furniture. He made many enquiries of Ilyich about household affairs; "What's the price of geese?" he asked; "How much is veal?" Ilyich did not know what to answer. "Geese??" "Veal??" Ilyich knew very little about household affairs, but even I could not tell him anything about geese and veal, for during our stay in Paris we had not eaten either the one or the other. Had the precentor interested himself in the price of horse-flesh and lettuce I could have told him.

All our people in Paris at that time longed terribly to go to Russia: there were Inessa, Safarov and others. We were only moving a little nearer to Russia.

#### CRACOW, 1912-14

Exile in Cracow was unlike that in Paris or Switzerland. In fact it was semi-exile. In Cracow we were almost entirely absorbed in the work in Russia. Close connections with Russia were very quickly established. Newspaper from St. Petersburg would arrive only three days old. At this time, *Pravda* was being published in Russia. "And in Russia the *revolutionary* revival is not any kind of a revival, but a *revolutionary* revival," Ilyich wrote to Gorki. "And we did after all succeed in establishing a daily *Pravda*—thanks, incidentally, to the very (January) conference which fools are abusing." Very close contacts were established with *Pravda*. Ilyich wrote articles for it almost every day, sent letters, watched it carefully and recruited contributors for it. He tried hard to persuade Maxim Gorki to write for it. Zinoviev also wrote regularly for the paper and collected interesting material on foreign affairs for it. Such systematic collaboration would have been impossible from Paris and Switzerland. Correspondence was also soon established. The Cracow comrades taught us how to arrange things more secretly. The important thing was to see to it that letters did not bear foreign post-marks as then the Russian police paid no attention to them. Peasant women from Russia

would come to market in Cracow and for a small fee would take our letters across and drop them into the letter-boxes in Russia.

About 4,000 Polish exiles lived in Cracow.

When we arrived in Cracow, we were met by Comrade Bagotsky—a Polish political exile, who immediately took us under his charge and helped us with our everyday and secret work. He taught us how to make use of the “polupaska” (or semi-passport; this was the term applied to the permits to cross the frontier given to the local inhabitants on either side). The “polupaska” cost very little and above all greatly facilitated the work of our illegal comrades in crossing to and from Russia. Many comrades crossed into Russia with the aid of these permits. . . . Once we got Stalin across that way. On the frontier the names of the passengers are called and each had to answer in Polish, “present.” I remember that I tried to teach this little wisdom to our comrades. Soon after we organised the crossing of the frontier illegally, i.e. by smuggling the comrades across. On the Russian side addresses to which comrades could go were supplied by Comrade Krylenko\* who lived in Lublin not far from the frontier at that time. In this way we were also able to smuggle illegal literature across. I must say that in Cracow the police did not spy on us, they did not intercept our correspondence and, generally speaking, they had no contact with the Russian police. . . .

We arrived in Cracow in the summer and Comrade Bagotsky advised us to move to the suburb of Zvezhintsa where we rented a house together with the Zinovievs. The streets in this district were unpaved and exceedingly muddy. But the river Vistula was quite near in which we were able to bathe, and about five kilometres away there was the “Volsky Lyas,” a beautiful wood which Ilyich and I frequently visited on our bicycles. In the autumn we moved to the other end of the town, a newly-built section. Bagotsky and the Zinovievs moved there with us.

Ilyich liked Cracow very much; it reminded him of Russia. The change of environment, the absence of emigre squabbles

\* Until recently, Chief Public Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R. and now Commissar of Justice of the U.S.S.R.—*Ed*

soothed our nerves somewhat. Ilyich carefully observed the everyday life of the Cracow population, its poverty and its workers. I, too, liked Cracow. I lived in Poland when I was a child from the age of two to five, something of it still remained in my memory, and so the wide verandas, looking on to the courtyard, appealed to me for they reminded me of the verandas on the steps of which I used to play with the Polish and Jewish children when I was a child. I liked the little gardens where sour milk and potatoes were sold. This reminded my mother also of her young days. And Ilyich was very happy that he had escaped from Paris at last. He was in a merry mood and would jokingly praise the sour milk and the Polish "motsna starka" (a strong corn-whisky).

Lilina could speak Polish better than any of us. I could speak it a little; I remembered some of it from childhood and had studied the language while in Siberia and Ufa and I had to speak Polish in my housekeeping affairs. Housekeeping was a much more serious business here than in Paris. There was no gas and we were compelled to light the stove every day. At the butcher's I asked for meat without bones, as it is sold in Paris. The butcher glared at me and answered: "The Lord God created cows with bones, so how can you expect me to sell you meat without bones?" We had to provide ourselves with bread for Mondays in advance, because on Mondays the bakers would be getting over the effects of "the night before" and the bakeries would be closed. One had to be able to haggle with the market women. There were Polish stores and Jewish stores. In the Jewish stores one could buy things ever so much cheaper than at the others, but one had to haggle over the price, to pretend to leave the shop in disgust and be called back by the shopkeeper.

The Jews lived in a separate quarter of the town and dressed differently from the rest of the inhabitants. In waiting-rooms of hospitals one could hear the patients, while waiting to see the doctor, seriously discussing whether Jewish children were exactly like Polish children. Once I heard such a conversation and close by there stood a little Jewish boy who overheard it all. The power of the Catholic clergy—of



the priests, was boundless in Cracow. They engaged in philanthropic work and gave assistance to those whose houses had been burned down, to aged women and to orphans; the convents organised registry offices for domestic servants and saw that they were not ill-treated by their mistresses. Going to church was the only recreation the down-trodden, ignorant population enjoyed. In Galicia feudal customs were still rife and were fostered by the Catholic Church. For example, a lady would come to the market to hire a servant. About a dozen peasant women who had come to the market to hire themselves as servants would surround the lady and would all kiss her hand. Tips were expected for all services. A carpenter or a coachman, on receiving a tip, would get down on his hands and knees and bow his head to the ground. But in spite of all this, the masses were filled with hatred for their masters. The nurse-maid whom the Zinovievs had hired for their little boy would go to church every morning. She was positively emaciated as a result of all the fasting and praying. When I talked to her she told me that she hated the masters, that once she had worked for three years for the wife of an officer who, like all ladies, would sleep until eleven o'clock, would take her coffee in bed and compelled her servants to dress her and pull on her stockings. This fanatically religious nurse-maid said that if a revolution broke out, she would be the first one to take a pitchfork and go against the masters. The poverty and wretchedness of the peasants and of the poor generally was evident all around and was still greater than in Russia at that time.

In Cracow, Vladimir Ilyich met Comrade Ganetsky, who had been a delegate of the Social-Democratic Party of Poland and Lithuania to the Second Congress and later acted as delegate of its Central Committee to the Stockholm and London Congresses. From Comrade Ganetsky and other Polish comrades, Vladimir Ilyich learned the particulars of the split which had occurred among the Polish Social-Democrats. Their Central Committee started a campaign against the Warsaw Committee which had the support of the entire Warsaw organisation. The Warsaw Committee demanded that the Central Committee pursue a line in

keeping with strict principles and take up a more definite position on the internal Party affairs of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. The Central Committee dissolved the Warsaw Committee and began to spread rumours to the effect that the latter had connections with the secret police. Vladimir Ilyich took the side of the Warsaw Committee. He wrote an article in which he defended them, and also wrote to the International Socialist Bureau protesting against the conduct of the Central Committee. The Warsaw Committee was closely connected with the masses in Warsaw and in other industrial centres (Lodz, etc.) Ilyich did not consider the fight of the "Rozlamovists," or Dissidents, as the Warsaw Committee was called, to be an extraneous affair, but as an important part of the general struggle within the Party, so acute at the time. Hence, he could not remain a mere onlooker. Nevertheless, his attention was mainly absorbed in Russian affairs.

Safarov and Inessa, close comrades, went from Paris to St. Petersburg to make preparations for the election campaign. They travelled with other people's passports. Inessa stopped at Cracow and visited us in Zvezhintsa and stayed with us for two days. We discussed all the arrangements with her and supplied her with addresses and connections. She and Ilyich discussed the whole plan of work. On her way, Inessa was to call on Nikolai Vasilievich Krylenko, who lived in Lublin in Poland not far from the Galician border, in order to discuss with him the arrangements for enabling comrades coming to Cracow to cross the frontier. Inessa and Safarov sent us a great deal of information about what was going on in St. Petersburg. After establishing connections there, they did a great deal of work in informing the Party workers of the resolutions passed at the Prague Conference and discussing with them the problems which then faced the party. They established their base in the Narva district of St. Petersburg. They restored the St. Petersburg Committee of the Party and later formed the Northern Regional Bureau of which Inessa and Safarov, as well as Shotman and his comrades, Rakhya and Pravdin, were members. A very acute fight was raging in St. Petersburg against the liquidators. The Northern Regional Bureau

prepared the ground for the election of Badayev, a Bolshevik, by trade a railwayman, as deputy for St. Petersburg. The liquidators were losing their influence over the masses of the St. Petersburg workers, who realised that instead of carrying on a revolutionary struggle the liquidators had taken the road of reform and were actually pursuing a liberal-labour policy. A determined struggle had to be waged against the liquidators. That is why Vladimir Ilyich was so upset when *Pravda* at first deliberately struck out from his articles all his arguments in opposition to the liquidators. He wrote angry letters to *Pravda* protesting against this. Only gradually did *Pravda* join in the struggle. The police, too, had made all preparations for the elections. On the fourteenth, Inessa and Safarov were arrested. But the police had not yet discovered Stalin, who had escaped from exile and had arrived on the twelfth. The elections of the workers' curias\* passed off quite successfully. Not a single candidate of the Right was elected. At all meetings resolutions of a political character were passed.

During the month of October, all attention was concentrated on the elections. In many districts the workers, owing to their ignorance and inertia, were indifferent to the elections and did not attach much importance to them, and so wide agitation had to be carried on in order to arouse their interest. Nevertheless, the workers everywhere elected Social-Democrats. The elections in the six workers' curias of the largest industrial centres all resulted in Bolshevik victories. Workers, members of the Party, who enjoyed great authority among their fellow workers, were elected. Six Bolsheviks and seven Menshevik deputies were elected to the Duma, but the six Bolshevik deputies represented a million workers, whereas the seven Menshevik deputies represented less than a quarter of a million workers. Moreover, from the very beginning,

\* The elections to the Duma were indirect, i.e. the electors did not vote directly for the members of the Duma, but for "electors" who formed a "curia" as it was called, which in turn voted for the members of the electoral college which finally elected members of the Duma. The curias were elected according to the social category of the voters, for example, landlords, peasants, urban middle class and workers, each category having its own curia.—*Ed.*

the Bolshevik group was distinguished for its discipline and solidarity. The opening of the Duma on October 18th was accompanied by workers' demonstrations and strikes. The Bolshevik deputies had to work in the Duma in conjunction with the Mensheviks. Meanwhile, the internal Party differences became more acute. In January the Prague Conference had taken place which played an important part in organising the Bolshevik forces.

Towards the end of August 1912 a so-called Party Conference had been convened in Vienna on the initiative and with the active participation of Trotsky. The object of this conference was stated to be to unite all the Social-Democratic forces, but the degree to which the roads of the liquidators and the Bolsheviks had diverged and the fact that the conduct of the liquidators was in complete variance with the Party line, were completely ignored. The *Vperyod*-ists were also invited to this conference. It could have been said in advance that the conference would bear a purely liquidationist character. Not only did the Bolsheviks, who supported the Central Committee, stay away from this conference, but so also did the Menshevik Plekhanovists and the Bolshevik conciliators who were grouped around Plekhanov's magazine *Za Partiu* (*For the Party*), which was published abroad. The Poles, too, stayed away and Alexinsky, who was sent to the conference by the *Vperyod* group, exposed the one-sided character of the conference. The great majority of the delegates of the conference were persons who lived abroad; two Caucasian delegates were sent to represent the Caucasian Regional Bureau; on the whole, all the delegates were elected by very small groups. The resolutions passed by the conference were of a pronounced liquidationist character. The slogan of a democratic republic was deleted from the election platform; the slogan of "revision of the agrarian law of the Third Duma" was substituted for the slogan of "confiscation of the landlord estates."

Boris Goldman (Gorev), one of the principal speakers at the conference, declared that the old Party no longer existed and that the present conference must become an "inaugural"

conference. Even Alexinsky protested against this. This amalgamation of compromises, the August bloc,\* as it became known, set itself in opposition to the Central Committee and tried to discredit the decisions of the Prague Conference. Under the cloak of unity, unity against the Bolsheviks was established.

Meanwhile, the labour movement in Russia was rising. This was proved by the elections.

Soon after the elections, Comrade Muranov, a member of the Duma, visited us. He crossed the border illegally. Ilyich was shocked at this. "What a scandal there would have been," he said to Muranov, "if you had been caught! You are a member of the Duma and enjoy parliamentary immunity; you would have suffered no harm had you come legally. You might have caused a scandal by the way you came." Muranov related many interesting events about the elections in Kharkov, about his Party work, how he got his wife to distribute leaflets when she went to market with him, etc. Muranov was an inveterate conspirator and he simply could not understand what "parliamentary immunity" meant. Ilyich talked with him about future work in the Duma and urged him to go back as quickly as possible. After this, members of the Duma would visit us openly.

The first conference with the members of the Duma took place at the end of December and the beginning of January.

Malinovsky† arrived first. He seemed to be very excited about something. I did not like him at first, his eyes seemed unpleasant to me and I did not like his affected ease; but this impression passed off after the first serious conversation we had with him. Then Petrovsky and Badayev‡ arrived. The deputies told us about their first month's work in the Duma and about their work among the masses. I can even now recall Badayev standing in the doorway waving his cap and saying: "Why, the masses have grown up enormously during these last few years!" Malinovsky gave one the impression of being a very intelligent and influential

\* See History of the CPSU, p. 136.

† Later proved to have been a spy.—Ed.

‡ Author of *The Bolsheviks in the Tsarist Duma*.—Ed.

worker. Badayev and Petrovsky were shy, but it was quite obvious that they were good, reliable proletarians. At this conference, the plan of work was drawn up, the character of the speeches to be delivered in the Duma, the character of the work to be carried on among the masses and the question of closely linking up this work with the illegal activity of the party were discussed. The work of supervising *Pravda* was assigned to Badayev. Comrade Medvedev arrived with the Duma deputies. He told us about his work of printing leaflets. Ilyich was quite pleased. "Malinovsky, Petrovsky and Badayev," he wrote to Gorki on January 1st, 1913, "send you their hearty greetings and best wishes. The Cracow base has proved useful: our coming to Cracow has proved quite worth-while (from the point of view of the cause)."

In the autumn the "great powers" intervened in the Balkan affair, and things began to smack of war. The International Socialist Bureau organised protest meetings everywhere. A meeting was also held in Cracow, but here they bore a rather peculiar character. This was more like a meeting called to rouse the hatred of the masses towards Russia than a protest meeting against war.

The International Socialist Bureau arranged to call a special congress of the Socialist International at Basle on November 11th and 12th. Kamenev was sent to this congress as representative of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

Vladimir Ilyich was indignant at an article written by Kautsky in *Neue Zeit*. This article was thoroughly opportunistic, and in it Kautsky argued that it would be a mistake for the workers to organise armed uprisings and strikes against war. Vladimir Ilyich had already written a great deal about the organising role strikes played in the revolution of 1905. After the publication of Kautsky's article he dealt with this question at greater length in a series of articles. He attached enormous importance to strikes as well as to other forms of direct action on the part of the masses.

At the Stuttgart Congress, 1907, five years before the Basle Congress, the question of war was discussed and outlined in

the spirit of revolutionary Marxism. During the intervening five years, opportunism had made enormous strides. Kautsky's article was a striking illustration of this. However, the Basle Congress unanimously adopted the manifesto against war and a huge mass anti-war demonstration was organised. Only in 1914 was the extent to which the Second International had been corroded by opportunism really revealed.

During the Cracow period, i.e., the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the imperialist war, Vladimir Ilyich devoted a great deal of attention to the national question. Since his early youth, he had hated national oppression in every form. Marx's statement that no greater misfortune can befall a nation than that it subdue another nation, was near and comprehensible to him.

War was approaching. The national spirit of the bourgeoisie was rising. The bourgeoisie tried to rouse national passion and hatred in every possible way. The approaching war bore with it the increased oppression of weak nationalities and the suppression of their independence. But the war would inevitably—Ilyich had no doubts about this—develop into rebellion; the oppressed nationalities would fight for their independence. This was their right. The International Socialist Congress held in London in 1896 had already confirmed this right. The under-estimation of the right of nations to self-determination at such a time, the end of 1912 and beginning of 1913, in the face of impending war, filled Vladimir Ilyich with indignation. Not only had the 'August bloc' failed to rise to the heights demanded by the situation, not only did it fail to bring this question out more sharply, but it even passed a resolution to the effect that cultural, national autonomy (concerning which a controversy had raged even in 1903 at the Second Party Congress and which was voted down at the time) was compatible with the point in the Party programme which demanded the right of nations to self-determination. This was tantamount to surrendering the position on the national question and to restricting the whole struggle to the struggle for culture, as if it were not obvious that culture was bound by a thousand threads to the political system. Ilyich regarded this as opportunism carried

to the utmost extreme. But the most serious controversy on the question of the right of nations to self-determination was carried on with the Poles. The latter, Rosa Luxemburg and the "Rozlamovists," maintained that the right of nations to self-determination does not necessarily mean the establishment of separate states. Ilyich appreciated the reasons why the Poles were disturbed on the question of the right to self-determination. The Polish masses were filled with burning hatred against tsarism—this manifested itself daily in Cracow: one remembered what his father had experienced during the Polish rebellion, and that he had barely escaped from the gallows; another remembered how the tsarist authorities desecrated the graves of his nearest and dearest by letting pigs into the cemetery, etc., etc. Russian tsarism had not only oppressed the Poles, but mocked at and humiliated them.

War was approaching, and with it was rising not only Black Hundred nationalism, not only the chauvinism of the bourgeoisie of the ruling states, but also the hopes of emancipation of the oppressed nationalities. The Polish Socialist Party was dreaming more and more about the independence of Poland. The growing separatist tendencies of the Polish Socialist Party—this Party was thoroughly petty-bourgeois—caused alarm among the Polish Social-Democrats. The Polish Social-Democrats were opposed to Poland's secession from Russia. Ilyich met members of the Polish Socialist Party. Several times he had talks with one of their best workers, Jodko, and he heard Dashinsky speak. He was, therefore, able to understand what was disturbing the Poles. "But we cannot approach the question of the right of nations to self-determination only from the point of view of the Poles!"—he would say.

The controversy on the national question which had arisen as early as the Second Congress of our Party became particularly acute on the eve of the war in 1913-14\* and continued in 1916 when the imperialist war was at its height.† In these disputes Ilyich played a leading part. The controversy proved to be very useful for it helped our Party to solve the national problem in the Soviet state when it was established,

\* Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. IV.

† *Ibid.*, Vol. V.



by creating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in which all nationalities are equal and the rights of none are restricted. In our country we see the rapid cultural development of the nationalities which formerly had lived under unbearable oppression. We see unity between the nationalities in the U. S. S. R. becoming closer and closer. In the U. S. S. R. numerous nationalities are united by the common ties of socialist construction.

It would be a mistake to think, however, that the national question which occupied Ilyich during the Cracow period made him forget such problems as the peasant question, to which he always attached very great significance. During the Cracow period, Vladimir Ilyich wrote over forty articles on the peasant question. He wrote a detailed memorandum *On the question of the Agrarian Policy (general) of the Present Government\** for the Duma deputy, Shagov, and a speech, *On the Question of the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture* for the Duma deputy, I. P. Petrovsky. In Cracow he began writing his big work, *New Data On the Laws of Development of Capitalism in Agriculture†* based on a study of American data. America is famous for the efficiency and wealth of her statistics. In this work Lenin set out to refute the views of Himmer (the name of the now notorious Sukhanov, one of the leading figures in the Menshevik wreckers' conspiracy case tried in 1931). Concerning him, Vladimir Ilyich wrote: Himmer is not a stranger, not a casual author of a casual magazine article, but one of the most prominent economists representing the most democratic, the extreme left *bourgeois* trend in Russian and European social thought. It is precisely for this reason that Mr. Himmer's views may become—and among the non-proletarian strata of the population have already become to a certain extent—particularly widespread and influential. For these are not his personal views, his individual mistakes; they are the expression of *common* bourgeois views—only particularly democratised, particularly embellished with pseudo-Socialist phraseology—which in the conditions of capitalist society are most readily accepted by official professors who follow the beaten track, and by those small farmers who are dis-

\* *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, pp. 226-241,

† Vol. XII, p. 190.

tinguished among the millions of their kind for their intelligence.

"The theory of the non-capitalist evolution of agriculture in capitalist society advanced by Mr. Himmer is in essence the theory of the vast majority of bourgeois professors, bourgeois democrats and opportunists in the labour movement throughout the world."...

Eight years after he had completed this book, in 1923, when Ilyich was already sick, he perused Sukhanov's memoirs of the revolution and dictated an article on them which was published in *Pravda* under the heading *Our Revolution*.\* In this article he wrote: "And now there can be no doubt that in the main we have been victorious." Sukhanov failed to understand this. Ilyich went on to say in the article: "I have lately been glancing through Sukhanov's *Notes on the Revolution*. What strikes me particularly is the pedantry of all our petty-bourgeois democrats as of all the heroes of the Second International... Apart from the fact that they are extraordinarily faint-hearted what strikes one is their slavish imitation of the past... They all call themselves Marxists, but their conception of Marxism is impossibly pedantic. They have completely failed to understand the decisive feature of Marxism, namely, its revolutionary dialectics... Their whole conduct betrays them as timorous reformists, fearful of making the slightest move away from the bourgeoisie, let alone breaking with it." Then he goes on to say that the world imperialist war created conditions which enabled us to achieve "the alliance of a 'peasant war' with the labour movement which no less a Marxist than Marx himself wrote of in 1856, in reference to Prussia, as one of the possible prospects."

Eight more years have passed since then. Ilyich is no longer among us, and still Sukhanov fails to understand the conditions the October Revolution has created for building Socialism, and actively strives to hinder the work of eradicating the remnants of capitalism; he does not realise how the face of our country has changed. Collective and state farms are growing and becoming consolidated. Tractors are ploughing up virgin soil. The old unploughed strips that served as the dividing lines between the innumerable small peasant

\* Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 509.

plots are a thing of the past ; labour is being organised on modern lines ; the entire aspect of agriculture has changed.

In the numerous articles he wrote during the Cracow period Ilyich dealt with a number of extremely important questions connected with peasant and landlord farming in which he gave a strikingly clear picture of the situation in this sphere at the time, outlined the agrarian programmes of the various parties and exposed the character of the government measures and called attention to a number of problems of extreme importance, for example, colonisation, wage labour in agriculture, child labour, the buying and selling of land, the concentration of peasant lands, etc. Ilyich knew the countryside and the needs of the peasants very well indeed, and both the workers and the peasants realised this.

The rise of the revolutionary labour movement at the end of 1912 and the role which *Pravda* played in this was obvious to all, even to the *Vperyod*-ists.

In November 1912, Alexinsky applied to the editorial board of *Pravda* in the name of the Paris group of the *Vperyod*-ists offering their co-operation. Alexinsky wrote a number of articles for *Pravda* and in No. 3 of the *Vperyod*-ist magazine *Na temy Dnya* (*Current Topics*) he even urged the necessity for putting a stop to the internal struggle within the Bolshevik ranks and the necessity for forming a bloc to include all the Bolsheviks for the purpose of fighting against the liquidators. The editorial board of *Pravda* not only included members of the Paris group like Alexinsky in its list of contributors, but also Bogdanov. Ilyich learned of this only through the press. One of Ilyich's characteristic traits was his ability to distinguish disputes on principles from personal disputes and his ability to place the interests of the cause above everything else. Even if Plekhanov did pour abuse on him, if the interests of the cause demanded that he should unite with him, Ilyich did not hesitate to do so..... When an opponent attacked him, Ilyich was roused, he hit back, pressed his own point of view ; but when new tasks arose and it was found possible to co-operate with the opponent, Ilyich was able to approach the opponent of yesterday as a comrade. He did not have to force himself to do this, it came naturally. Herein lay Ilyich's tremendous power. For all his jealousy

touching questions of principle, he was a great optimist as far as persons were concerned. He would sometimes err, but on the whole this optimism was very beneficial for the cause. But if agreement could not be reached on matters of principle, then there was no reconciliation.

In a letter to Gorki, Ilyich wrote: "I am ready with all my heart to share your joy at the return of the *Vperyod*-ists, that is, *if.....if* your supposition that Machism, god-creating, and all that stuff are really, as you say, a thing of the past. If that really is the case, if *Vperyod*-ists have realised, or will realise this now, then I heartily join you in your joy at their return. But I emphasise the *if*, because so far, it is more a wish than a fact.....I do not know whether Bogdanov, Bazarov, Volsky (a semi-anarchist), Lunacharsky and Alexinsky are *capable of learning* a lesson from the trying experiences of the years 1908-11. Have they learned that Marxism is something more serious and more profound than they thought, that one cannot mock at it as Alexinsky did, or scorn it as a dead object, as others did. *If* they have realised that—a thousand greetings to them, and all personal things (which inevitably arise in acute struggles) will disappear in a twinkling. However, if they have not realised this, if they have not learned the lesson, then don't blame me: friendship is friendship, and duty is duty. We will fight to the death against any attempt to throw mud at Marxism or to confuse the policy of the workers' party."

"I am very glad that a *road* has been found for a gradual return of the *Vperyod*-ists via *Pravda*, which did not attack them directly. I am very glad. But for the sake of a more *durable* friendship, we must approach it slowly, cautiously. I have said the same thing in *Pravda*. The friends who are anxious to bring about a reunion between us and the *Vperyod*-ists must also concentrate their efforts on this: a *cautious return* of the *Vperyod*-ists, tested by experience, from Machism, Otvovism and god-creating can do a devil of a lot of good. The slightest carelessness, however, may cause a relapse to Machism; Otvovism, etc.—and a more bitter struggle than ever is likely to flare up.....I have not read Bogdanov's *Philosophy of Living Experience*; very likely it is the old, mechanistic philosopher in a new garb."

Reading these lines now, one vividly recalls the whole path of struggle and the whole of that period of disruption between 1908 and 1911. When that period had passed and Ilyich had become completely absorbed in Russian work and was carried away by the growing revival of the movement, he could speak more calmly about the *Vperyod*-ists, but he hardly believed, or to be more correct, he did not believe at all that Alexinsky was capable of learning from experience and that Bogdanov would give up Machism. Things turned out exactly as Ilyich anticipated. An open conflict soon broke out with Bogdanov who, on the pretext of popularising the word "ideology" attempted to drag his philosophy into *Pravda*. Things finally reached the point where Bogdanov was removed from the list of contributors to *Pravda*.

In the Cracow period Vladimir Ilyich's thoughts were already directed towards socialist construction. Of course, this can only be said in a conventional sense, for at that time the direction the socialist revolution in Russia would take was not yet clear. Nevertheless, had we not experienced the Cracow period of semi-exile at a time when leadership of the political struggle of the Duma fraction required the concrete handling of questions of economic and cultural life, it would have been difficult, in the period immediately following the October revolution, to deal with all the aspects of Soviet construction that arose. It was a sort of "standard O" (preparatory class) for socialist construction. Of course at first, Ilyich merely presented these problems in rough outline, but so vividly that his formulations hold good even to-day.

During this time Vladimir Ilyich devoted considerable attention to questions of culture. At the end of December, arrests and raids occurred in St. Petersburg among the students of the Vitmer Gymnasium.\* The Vitmer Gymnasium was, of course, different from other gymnasiums. The head mistress and her husband took an active part in the first Marxist study circles that were formed in the 'nineties. In 1905-7 they rendered considerable service to the Bolsheviks. In the Vitmer Gymnasium the students were permitted to

\* High School.—*Ed.*

participate in political life, to form political circles, etc. And so the police raided this gymnasium. A question was asked in the Duma concerning the arrest of the students. The Minister for Education, Kasso, gave an explanation. His explanation was rejected as unsatisfactory by a majority of votes. In an article entitled "Increasing Discrepancies," written for Nos. 3 and 4 of *Prosveshchenie* (*Education*) in 1913, Vladimir Ilyich, remarking that in connection with the arrests of the students of the Vitmer Gymnasium, the Duma had passed a vote of no confidence in Kasso, the Minister for Education, added that this was not the only thing that people should know. "The people and the democracy must know the *reasons* for this lack of confidence in order to *understand* the causes of what is regarded as abnormal in politics, and in order to be able to find a *way* to the normal." He then goes on to examine the manner in which the various parties in the Duma formulated their motion to proceed to the order of the day. "After examining the manner in which the Social-Democrats formulated their motion, Ilyich goes on to say: "Even this formula cannot be regarded as faultless. We cannot but wish that it were drafted in a more popular and clearer style; we cannot but regret that it did not point out the legality of engaging in politics, etc., etc. But our criticism of *all the formulae* is not in the least directed against the manner in which they were drafted, but is directed exclusively against the political ideas of their authors. The main thing a democrat should have said was: that circles and discussion are *natural and should be welcomed*. That is the point. All condemnation of political activity even 'at an early age' is hypocrisy and obscurantism. A democrat should have raised the question from that of a 'united cabinet' to that of the political regime. A democrat should have pointed out the 'indissoluble connection' firstly 'with the domination of the secret police,' secondly with the domination of the class of big landlords of the feudal type in economic life."

\* Similar to: move the adjournment of the House — *Ed.*

This is how Vladimir Ilyich taught how to link up concrete questions of culture with important political questions.

In speaking about culture, Ilyich always emphasised the connection between culture and the general political and economic system. In protesting resolutely against this slogan of cultural-national autonomy, Ilyich wrote: "As long as different nationalities live under a single state they are bound together by millions and billions of threads of an economic legal and social character. How can we exclude education from these ties? Can education be 'removed from the sphere of control' of the state, as that classical example of absurdity, the formula of the Bund puts it? If economics unite nations who live under a single state then the attempt to divide them once and for all in the sphere of 'culture,' and particularly on questions of education, is absurd and reactionary. On the contrary, we strive to *unite* the nations in the sphere of education in order that the school may prepare for what is carried out in life. At present we see the inequality of nations and unevenness in their level of development; under such conditions the division of education according to nationality will indeed be a handicap for the more backward nations. In the Southern States in America which were formerly slave states, Negro children to this very day are taught in separate schools, while in the Northern States white and Negro children attend the same schools."

In February 1913 Vladimir Ilyich wrote a special article entitled "Russians and Negroes," in which he strove to show that the ignorance, the cultural backwardness of one class puts its stamp upon the culture of the entire country.

What Vladimir Ilyich said about proletarian policy in the sphere of education at that time is exceedingly interesting. In arguing against cultural autonomy, against "removing education from the sphere of control of the state," he wrote as follows: "The interests of democracy in general and the interest of the working class in particular demand precisely the opposite. We must strive to secure that the children of all nationalities of a given locality attend the same school; that the workers of all nationalities *jointly* carry out the proletarian policy in education that was so well formulated by Samoilov, a delegate of the Vladimir workers, in the name

of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, in the Duma (Samoilov demanded the separation of the church from the state and the schools from the church; he demanded the complete secularisation of the schools)." Vladimir Ilyich also said that it would be easily possible to arrange for the children of the national minorities to study their own culture under real democracy when bureaucracy and Peredonovism\* are driven from the schools.

In the summer of 1913 Ilyich wrote an outline of a speech Badayev was to deliver in the Duma on "The Policy of the Ministry of Education." In delivering this speech in the Duma, Badayev was continuously interrupted by the President of the Duma, and finally was prevented from finishing it. In his outline Ilyich quoted statistics showing the amazing cultural backwardness of the country and the insignificant sum assigned by the government for education. He showed how the policy of the tsarist government blocked the road to education for nine-tenths of the population. He described the government's treatment of teachers as "savage, shameful, disgusting and tyrannical." Here, too, he drew a comparison between Russia and America. In America, he wrote, 11 per cent. of the total population was illiterate but among the Negroes 44 per cent. was illiterate; "nevertheless education is twice as high among American Negroes as it is among the Russian peasants." Negroes were more literate than Russian peasants in 1900 because half a century before that the American people defeated the American slave owners. The Russian people should also have overthrown their government in order to make their country a literate, cultured country.

Ilyich also wrote the outline of a speech for Comrade Shagov, in which he wrote that the only way by which Russia can become a literate country is by taking the land from the landowners and giving it to the peasants. In an article written at that time entitled "What can be Done for Education?" Ilyich described in great detail how libraries were organised in America and urged that the same system be

\* Peredonov—a high-school teacher—character in Sologub's *Little Demon*, typifying the cringing, spiteful bureaucrat, servile to superiors and brutal to subordinates.



adopted in Russia. In June he wrote an article entitled "The Working Class and Neo-Malthusianism," in which he wrote: "We are fighting better than our fathers did; our children will fight better than we are fighting and *they will be victorious*. The working class is not perishing, it is growing and becoming stronger, more manly, more united, it is becoming enlightened and hardened in the struggle. We are pessimists in regard to feudalism, capitalism and small industry, but we are ardent optimists so far as the labour movement as a whole is concerned. We are laying the foundations for a new edifice and our children will complete it."<sup>\*</sup>

Ilyich gave his attention also to a number of other questions which have practical significance in socialist construction. Characteristic of this Cracow period are articles he wrote like the one entitled "Great Victory of Technique," in which he compared the role of great inventions under capitalism and under Socialism. Under capitalism, he wrote, inventions lead to the enrichment of a handful of millionaires, the worsening of the general conditions of life of the workers and the growth of unemployment. "Under Socialism the application of Ramsay's method of 'releasing' millions of miners, etc. from labour will make it possible immediately to shorten the working day for all from eighth to seven hours and even less. The electrification of all factories and railways will make the conditions of labour more hygienic, will relieve millions of workers of smoke, dust and dirt; the dirty, repulsive workshops will very soon be converted into clean and well lit laboratories worthy of human beings. Electric lighting and heating of all dwellings will relieve millions of domestic slaves of the necessity of wasting three-fourths of their lives in smelly kitchens. Capitalist technique is every day more and more *outstripping* the social conditions, which condemn the toilers to wage slavery." Seventeen years ago Ilyich was already thinking about electrification, a seven-hour day, factory kitchens and the emancipation of women. (See *Lenin on Britain*, p. 40. Ed.)

The article entitled "A Fashionable Branch of Industry," showed that seventeen years ago Ilyich was already thinking

<sup>\*</sup> English Translation in the *Labour Monthly*, October, 1927.—Ed.

about the significance of the automobile industry under socialism. In his article "Iron in Agriculture," Ilyich describes iron as the "foundation of the culture of a country." "We all like to talk a great deal about culture, about the development of productive forces, about raising peasant economy to a higher level, etc," he wrote, "but as soon as the question arises of removing the obstacle which stands in the way of 'raising' the millions of poverty-stricken, down-trodden, hungry, barefooted, uncivilised peasants to a higher level, then our millionaires lose their power of speech..... our industrial magnates prefer to share their mediaeval privileges with the Purishkeviches\* and to sigh about the liberation of the 'fatherland' from mediaeval lack of culture."

But Ilyich's article, "The Ideas of Progressive Capital," is particularly interesting. In this article he discusses the ideas of an American millionaire businessman named Filene, who tried to persuade the masses to accept the employers as their leaders, because the employers were learning more and more to understand their interests and because the interests of the employers and the masses were common interests. Democracy is developing, Ilyich wrote in this article, the strength of the masses is growing, the cost of living is rising. Parliament and the daily Press with its huge circulations are making the masses more and more informed. Hence the aim of the progressive capitalists is to fool the masses, to make them believe that there is no antagonism of interests between labour and capital and they are prepared to spend a certain amount of money (by giving office employees and skilled workers a share in the profits) in order to achieve their aim. After examining the ideas of progressive capitalism, Ilyich exclaims: "Most esteemed Mr. Filene! are you sure that the workers of the whole world are such fools?"

These articles, written seventeen years ago, show how much interested Ilyich was in problems of construction at

\* Purishkevich, a Bessarabian landlord and diehard reactionary; founder of the notorious League of Russian People better known as the "Black Hundred," which, aided and abetted by the tsarist police, perpetrated the pogroms or murderous mob attacks on Jews and revolutionaries.—Ed.

that time. When the Soviet government was established these problems were already familiar to him; all that had to be done was to apply the solutions that he had already worked out.

In the autumn of 1912 we made the acquaintance of Nikolai Ivanovich Bukharin. Besides Bagotsky, whom we frequently met, Casimir Chapinski, a Pole who worked on the Cracow newspaper *Napshud* (*Forward*), visited us. He told us a great deal about the famous Cracow resort Zakopane and described the glorious mountains and beauty of the place. Incidentally, he told us that a Social-Democrat named Orlov, who was making beautiful paintings of the Zakopane mountains, was living there. One day, soon after we had moved from Zvezhintsa to the city, we were looking through the window and observed a youngish-looking man, carrying a large canvas bag on his back, coming towards the house. This proved to be Orlov—otherwise Bukharin. He and Ilyich had quite a long talk that day. Bukharin lived in Vienna. From that time onwards close connection was established with Vienna. The Troyanovskys lived there, too. When we asked Nikolai Ivanovich (Bukharin) about his paintings he took a number of splendid paintings by German artists from his bag and we examined them with great interest. Among them were works by Boeckling and a number of other artists. Vladimir Ilyich liked pictures very much. I remember how surprised I was when, one evening when we were visiting Vorovsky, Ilyich found a heap of illustrated descriptions of the works of various artists and read them and studied the reproductions of the pictures with great interest throughout the evening.

Many people visited us at Cracow at that time. Comrades who were on their way to Russia would stop to make arrangements about their work. One day Nikolai Nikolaevich Yakovlev, the brother of Varvara Nikolaevna, came to visit us and stayed for about two weeks. He was on his way to Moscow, where he was to start a Bolshevik paper, *Nash Put* (*Our Way*). He was a staunch and reliable Bolshevik. Ilyich had long talks with him. Kakovlev started the paper, but it was soon suppressed and he was arrested. This is not surprising, for Malinovsky, the Moscow delegate, "helped" to

start the paper. When he was with us Malinovsky told us a great deal about the journeys he had made through the Moscow province and about the workers' meetings which he said he had conducted. Once he told us about a meeting at which he said a policeman was present who listened very attentively and tried to be helpful. While relating this incident Malinovsky laughed. Generally he liked to talk a great deal about himself. He told us why he had volunteered for the Russo-Japanese war. He was at a recruiting office, he said, to report in answer to the mobilisation order, when a demonstration passed by. He could not control himself, and he made a speech from the window. He was arrested for this and the colonel came to him and said he would not send him to a military prison if he volunteered to go to war. He had no alternative but to go, said Malinovsky. He also told us that his wife was religious and that when she discovered that he was an atheist she tried to commit suicide, and that she frequently had nervous fits after that. Malinovsky's tales seemed queer to us. No doubt there was some truth in them. He told us what he had actually experienced, but he did not tell us the whole truth; he left out the most important points and many pictures he painted in false colours. Later on I thought—perhaps the story he told us about what happened at the recruiting office was true and perhaps, on returning from the war, the police presented him with an ultimatum either to become an *agent provocateur* or to go to prison. Perhaps his wife was of a morbid nature, and did really attempt to commit suicide, but the reason may have been some other than that which Malinovsky gave us; perhaps she suspected her husband of being an *agent provocateur*. At all events Malinovsky's tales were interwoven with truth and this made them sound plausible. It did not occur to anyone at the time that he was a police spy.

The government tried to place another *agent provocateur* on the *Pravda* in addition to Malinovsky. This was Chernomazov. He lived in Paris and on his way to Russia he, too, stopped at Cracow and brought us a letter from Piatnitsky. He was going to work for *Pravda*. We did not like Chernomazov and I did not even ask him to stay the night with

us, so he was compelled to spend the night walking the streets of Cracow.

Ilyich attached tremendous importance to *Pravda* and wrote articles almost every day for it. He would carefully note where collections had been made for the paper, how much had been collected, how many articles were written for it, on what subjects, etc. He was exceedingly happy when the paper published good articles and pursued a correct policy. Once, at the end of 1913, he asked *Pravda* to send him a list of its subscribers and for about two weeks my mother and I sat evening after evening sorting the names of the subscribers according to the cities in which they lived. Nine-tenths of the subscribers were workers. We would come across a town with many subscribers. On looking up the town we found that there was a large factory there about which we had not known. The chart which we drew up showing the distribution of the *Pravda* was a very interesting one; Ilyich was very pleased with it, but it was never printed. In all probability Chernomazov threw it into the waste-paper basket. But much worse things than this happened. Sometimes, although rarely, Ilyich's articles would get lost. Sometimes his articles would be held up and printed only after some delay. This irritated Ilyich and he wrote angry letters to *Pravda*, but that did not improve matters. . . . .

In the middle of February 1913 a conference of the members of the Central Committee was held in Cracow. Our Duma deputies arrived. Stalin also arrived. Ilyich had met Stalin at the Tammerfors Conference and at the Stockholm and London Congresses. Ilyich had long discussions with Stalin on the national question. He was glad to meet a man who was seriously interested in this question and who was well informed on it. Prior to his arrival in Cracow Stalin had spent two months in Vienna where he had studied the national question. There he became closely connected with our people, Bukharin and Troyanovsky. After the conference Ilyich wrote to Gorki about Stalin as follows: "We have a wonderful Georgian here who is writing a long article for *Prosveshchenie*. He has collected all the Austrian as well as other material for it." At that time Ilyich was worried about the *Pravda*, and so also was Stalin. 'They discussed

methods of putting things right. I think Comrade Troyanovsky was invited to these discussions. Vladimir Ilyich had great faith in the Troyanovskys and expected a great deal of them. Elena Fedorovna Trayanovskaya (Rozmirovich), was preparing to go to Russia. At this conference the position of *Prosveshchenie* was discussed and also the question of *Pravda* issuing a series of pamphlets. Wide plans were drawn up.

Just before this a parcel arrived from home containing salmon, caviar and sturgeon. I borrowed a cookery book from my mother and gave a party. Vladimir Ilyich, who loved to treat his comrades to the best he had, was highly satisfied with the whole affair.

On his return to Russia Stalin was arrested in St. Petersburg on February 22nd.

Our life in Cracow was rather monotonous when there were no visitors. "We are living here as if we were in Shushya."\* I wrote to Ilyich's mother, "the coming of the postman is the greatest event to look forward to. Until eleven o'clock we try to pass the time away somehow or another. At eleven o'clock the postman comes and then he comes again at six—we can hardly wait so long."... ..

We decided to move to Poronino,† seven kilometres from Zakopane, for the summer. Zakopane was too overcrowded and expensive; Poronino was simpler and cheaper. We, that is, the Zinovievs, the Bagotskys and their famous dog Zhulik, rented a large bungalow and moved out together. This bungalow was situated 700 metres above sea-level at the foot of the Tatra mountains. The air was wonderful, and although there were frequent mists and drizzle the view of the mountains during the clear intervals was extremely beautiful. We would climb up to the plateau which was quite close to our bungalow and watch the snow-capped peaks of the Tatra mountains..... Sometimes Ilyich and Bagotsky would go to Zakopane to visit Vigelev and take long walks in the moun-

\* Shuskenkoye, the Siberian village where Lenin and Krupskaya spent their exile.—*Ed.*

† In the winter of 1913 Krupskaya had become seriously ill, suffering from Graves' disease and heart weakness. A doctor recommended them to go to the mountains at Zakopane.—*Ed.*

tains with him. Ilyich was exceedingly fond of walking. The mountain air helped me very little. My health got worse and after consulting Bagotsky, who was a neurologist, Ilyich insisted on my going to Berne to be operated on by Kocher. We went there in the middle of June. On our way we stopped in Vienna and visited the Bukharins. Nadezhda Mikhailovna, Bukharin's wife, was very sick and Bukharin had to look after the house. Putting sugar instead of salt into the soup, he talked animatedly with Ilyich about questions which interested Ilyich and about our people who lived in Vienna. We met some of the Vienna comrades and rode about the town with them. Vienna has a charm of its own. It is a large capital city and in contrast with Cracow we were greatly impressed by it. In Berne the Shklovskys took charge of us and fussed over us a great deal. They lived in a little detached cottage with a garden. Ilyich joked with the younger girls and teased Jenurka. I stayed in the hospital about three weeks. Ilyich would stay with me half the day and spend the rest of the day in the libraries. He read a great deal; he even read a number of medical books on my disease and took extensive notes on questions that interested him. While I was in the hospital he visited Zurich, Geneva and Lausanne to deliver lectures on the national question. He also lectured on the subject in Berne. In Berne,—this was after I left the hospital—a conference of the groups abroad was held at which the state of Party affairs was discussed. After the operation I had to spend about two weeks recuperating in the mountains in Gutenberg, where Kocher advised me to go, but we received word from Poronino that there were many urgent affairs to be settled and on the receipt of a telegram from Zinoviev we went back.

On the way we stopped at Munich. Boris Knipovich, a nephew of Lydia Mikhailovna (known as Dyadenka), lived there. I had known him since he was quite a child when I used to tell him fairy tales. He—the four-year-old blue-eyed little Boris—would climb up on my knees, put his arms round my neck and say: "Krupa, tell me the story about the little tin soldier." In 1905-07 Boris was an active organiser of Social-Democratic groups among college students. In the summer of 1907, after the London Congress, Ilyich had lived

with the Knipoviches in the village of Stirsudden in Finland. At that time Boris was still a college student, but he was already interested in Marxism and would listen with rapt attention to what Ilyich had to say. He revered and loved both Ilyich and Dyadenka. In 1911 he was arrested and later was exiled abroad. He went to Munich and studied at the Munich University. In 1912 he published his first book on *The Differentiation Among the Russian Peasantry*, a copy of which he sent to Ilyich. In reply Ilyich wrote him a letter, in which he displayed particular attention and interest in the young author. "I read your book with great pleasure," he wrote, "and I was very glad that you undertook to write a big and serious work. A work of this kind will certainly enable you to test, deepen and strengthen your Marxian convictions." And then Lenin proceeded very discreetly to suggest several corrections and give him advice as to method.

On re-reading this letter, I recall Ilyich's attitude towards inexperienced authors. In discussing their work with them he would get right down to the heart of the subject, to the fundamentals, and make suggestions for improvement. But he did this all very discreetly, so that these authors hardly noticed that they were being corrected. And Ilyich was very good at helping people in their work. If, for example, he wanted someone to write an article but was not sure whether he would be able to do it properly, he would start a discussion with him, expound his ideas and get the prospective writer interested. After he had sounded him on the subject sufficiently, he would say to him: "Would you like to write an article on this subject?" And the author would not even have noticed that his preliminary discussion with Ilyich had helped him and that in writing his article he had actually used Ilyich's expressions and turns of phrase.

We would have liked to stay at Munich for several days to see the changes that had taken place since the time we lived there in 1902, but we were in such a hurry to get back that we stayed there only for several hours until we got the train. Boris and his wife came to meet us. We spent the time in the restaurant which was famous for its Hofbrau beer. On the walls and on the beer-mugs were inscribed the initials H. B., which looked like the Russian letters N. V.



"This is the Narodnaya Volya beer-house," I said in jest. Ilyich praised the Munich beer as if he were a connoisseur. He and Boris talked about the class differentiation among the peasantry, and his wife and I talked about Dyadenka who just then was very sick. Ilyich jotted down a few lines to her, urging her to go abroad and be operated upon by Kocher. We arrived at Poronino at the beginning of August—I think it was the sixth. There we were met by the usual Poronino rain, by Lev Borisovich Kamenev and a great deal of news about Russia.

A conference of the members of the Central Committee had been arranged for the 9th. *Pravda* had been closed down. In its place *Rabochaya Pravda* (*Workers' Truth*) was being published, but almost every number was suppressed. Strikes were breaking out everywhere—in St. Petersburg, Riga, Nikolayev and Baku. Of the Duma deputies present I remember only Malinovsky. The conference discussed the affairs of *Rabochaya Pravda*, the Moscow *Prosveshchenie* and the Priboy Publishing House, the tactics to be pursued at the forthcoming co-operative and commercial class congresses and other urgent problems.

Kamenev moved into the flat above ours, and in the evenings he and Ilyich, after dinner, would stay in our large kitchen and discuss the news from Russia.

Preparations were going forward for the Party Conference, which became known as the "summer conference." This was held in Poronino from September 21st to October 1st. All the Duma deputies arrived except Samoilov. There were also two Moscow electors, Novozhilo and Balashov, Rozmirovich from Kiev, Sima Deryabina from the Urals, Shotman from St. Petersburg and others. *Prosveshchenie* was represented by Troyanovsky, the Poles by Ganetsky, Donsky and by two Rozlamovists (the influence of the Rozlamovists at that time had spread over the four largest industrial districts in Poland—Warsaw, Lodz, Dombrow and Kalish). While the conference was in progress Inessa arrived. She had been arrested in September 1912 with a false passport. Conditions in prison were very hard and had undermined her health; she showed symptoms of tuberculosis, but she had not lost any of her energy and flung herself into Party work.

with all her usual ardour. We were all very glad that she had arrived. In all there were twenty-four persons present at the conference.

At the conference it was decided to raise the question of convening a Party congress. Six years had passed since the Fifth Congress held in London and there had been many changes since then. The questions before the conference were as follows: the strike movement; the preparations for the general political strike, the tasks of agitation, the publication of a number of popular pamphlets, the inadmissibility of modifying the slogans—Democratic Republic, Confiscation of the Landlords' Land and the Eight-Hour Day—in the course of carrying on agitation. The question of how to carry on work in legal societies and how to carry on Social-Democratic work in the Duma was discussed. The decisions on the necessity of obtaining equal rights for the Bolsheviks in the Social-Democratic Duma fraction and on preventing the Bolsheviks in the fraction from being voted down by a majority of one, by the "seven"\* who represented only an insignificant minority of the workers, were particularly important. The other important resolution which was passed was that on the national question which expressed the views of Vladimir Ilyich. I remember the disputes which took place in our kitchen on this question. I remember the passions that were roused around it and the ardour with which it was discussed.

This time Malinovsky was in a terribly nervous state; he would get drunk night after night, would become maudlin and complain that he was mistrusted. The Moscow electors,† Balashov and Novozhilov, were very indignant at his behaviour. They sensed a certain falseness and play-acting in Malinovsky's stories and conduct.

We remained in Poronino for another two weeks after the conference. We walked a great deal and visited Cherny Stav,

\* As has been previously explained, the Social-Democratic deputies in the Duma numbered thirteen, six Bolsheviks and seven Mensheviks, although the Bolsheviks represented a far larger number of workers than the Mensheviks. The Mensheviks, however, took advantage of their majority of one to force their line of policy on the whole of the Duma fraction.

† Electors. See Note, p. 66.

a mountain lake of extraordinary beauty, and other places in the mountains.

All of us, the entire Cracow group, became very much attached to Inessa. She always seemed to be in good spirits and full of vigour. We had known her in Paris, but there was a large colony there, whereas in Cracow we lived in a small, comradely, isolated circle. Inessa rented a room in the same flat where Kamenev lived. My mother grew very fond of her and often visited her to have a chat and a smoke. It seemed cosier and livelier when Inessa was present.

We were all absorbed in Party affairs and our mode of life resembled that of students rather than family life and we were very glad to have Inessa. She told us a great deal about her life and about her children; she showed me their letters and in speaking about them she seemed to radiate warmth and ardour. Ilyich, Inessa and I did a lot of walking. Zinoviev and Kamenev dubbed us the "Hikers' Party." We usually took walks along the meadows outside the city. The Polish word for meadow is *blon*, and it was from that that Inessa assumed the pseudonym of Blonina. Inessa loved music and made us attend Beethoven concerts. She herself was a good musician and played many of Beethoven's compositions very well indeed. Ilyich was particularly fond of the *Sonata Pathetique* and he always asked her to play it. Ilyich, too, loved music. Later, in Soviet times, he would visit Comrade Tsurupa to hear the Sonata played by some famous musician. We talked a lot about fiction. "The thing we are starved for here is fiction," I wrote to Ilyich's mother. "Volodya\* has nearly learnt the works of Nadson and Nekrasov by heart and the only volume we possess of *Anna Karenina* has been read and re-read for the hundredth time. We left our works of fiction, an insignificant part of what we had in St. Petersburg, in Paris and here we cannot get any Russian books. Sometimes we greedily read the advertisements of second-hand book dealers advertising twenty-eight volumes of Uspensky, ten volumes of Pushkin, etc., etc. To make matters worse, Volodya has suddenly become a great lover of *belles-lettres*. And he is a terrible nationalist. He would not go to see the works of Polish painters for anything. But

\* The pet name for Vladimir (Lenin).—Ed.

one day he picked up a catalogue of the Tretyakov Galleries at the home of one of our friends and frequently becomes absorbed in it."

At first we thought that Inessa would remain in Cracow and would bring her children over from Russia. I even helped her to look for an apartment. But we lived a very isolated life in Cracow which reminded one somewhat of exile. There was nothing in Cracow which could provide Inessa with an outlet for her abundant energies. She decided to make the rounds of our groups abroad and deliver a series of lectures and then to settle in Paris in order to organise the work of our committee abroad. Before her departure I had long talks with her about women's work. She strongly insisted upon the necessity for conducting propaganda work among women workers, and of publishing a special women workers' magazine in St. Petersburg. Ilyich wrote to Anna Ilyinishna about the publication of such a magazine which was published soon after. Later on Inessa did a great deal for the development of work among working women and devoted much effort to this.

In January 1914 Malinovsky came to Cracow and he and Ilyich went to Paris and from there to Brussels to attend the Fourth Congress of the Lettish Social-Democrats which was opened on January 13th.

In Paris Malinovsky delivered what in Ilyich's opinion was a very able report on the work of the Duma fraction and Ilyich delivered a lengthy address on the national question. He also spoke at meetings in memory of January 9th.\* In addition he spoke at a meeting of the Bolshevik group in Paris on the intervention of the International Socialist Bureau in Russian affairs and on the statement that Kautsky made at the December meeting of the International Socialist Bureau to the effect that the Social-Democratic Party in Russia was dead. Ilyich was greatly disturbed by the decision of the International Socialist Bureau to intervene in Russian affairs, because he thought that that would merely serve to retard the growing influence of the Bolsheviks in Russia. Ilyich sent a report to Huysmans, the Secretary of the International

\* I.e. Bloody Sunday, 1905, the events leading to the revolution.

Bureau, on the situation in the Party. The Fourth Congress of the Lettish Social-Democrats resulted in a victory for the Bolsheviks. At this Congress Comrades Berzin, Latsis, Herman and a number of other Lettish Bolsheviks were present. Ilyich spoke at the Congress and appealed to the Letts to affiliate to the Central Committee. In a letter to his mother Ilyich wrote that the trip to Paris had refreshed him. "Paris is not a city for people with modest means; it is very tiring," he wrote. "But for a short visit there is not a better or livelier city. It braced me up very much."

In the winter, soon after Vladimir Ilyich returned from Paris, it was decided that Kamenev should go to Russia to take charge of *Pravda* and to supervise the work of the Duma fraction. Both the newspaper and the Duma fraction needed help. In the meantime Kamenev's wife and little son arrived. Kamenev's little son and little Stepa Zinoviev had heated discussions as to whether St. Petersburg was a city in Russia. The departure for Russia began. We all went to the station to see them off. It was a cold winter evening. We spoke very little. Only Kamenev's little son kept up a steady chatter. Everyone was wrapped up in his own thoughts. We all asked ourselves how long Kamenev would hold out, how soon would we meet? When would we be able to go to Russia? Each of us secretly thought about Russia; each of us had a strong desire to go. Night after night I would dream about Nevaskaya Zastava (a suburb of St. Petersburg). We avoided speaking of this subject but all of us secretly thought about it.

On March 8th, 1914, International Women's Day, the first number of the popular magazine *Rabotnitsa* (*The Woman Worker*) appeared in St. Petersburg. It was sold at four kopeks a copy. The St. Petersburg Party committee issued leaflets on Women's Day. Inessa and Stahl wrote articles for the magazine from Paris and Lilina and I wrote from Cracow. Seven numbers of this magazine were published. We were preparing No. 8 and planned to have articles on the Socialist Women's Congress which was to take place in Vienna, but that issue never appeared—the war broke out.

We tried to convene a Party Congress to take place at the same time as the International Socialist Congress which was

to take place in Vienna in August. We hoped that some of the delegates would be able to come legally. Then it was planned that the crossing of the border *en masse* should be organised under the guise of an excursion. This was to be arranged by the printers in Cracow.

In May we moved back again to Poronino.

In order to prepare the campaign for the congress in St. Petersburg, Comrades Kisilev, Glebov-Avilov and Anna Nikiforova were mobilised. They came to Poronino to discuss the arrangements with Ilyich. On the first day of their arrival we sat for a long time on top of a little hill near our bungalow and they told us about the work in Russia. They were all young, full of energy and made a good impression upon Ilyich. Glebov-Avilov had been a pupil at the Bologna school, but had now left the *Vperyod*-ists.....

Finally, the character of the agitation to be carried on at the congress was decided upon. Having received all the necessary instructions Kisilev went to the Baltic region and Glebov-Avilov and Anna went to the Ukraine.

Among those who came from Moscow was Alya, a former Capri student, who, in later turned out, was an *agent provocateur*. I cannot recall on what pretext he came, but he wanted information about the congress which was to be held shortly. The secret police, of course, wanted to have more authentic information about the congress and so they sent him.

Inessa brought her children over from Russia for the summer and lived in Trieste by the sea. She was preparing a report on the International Women's Congress which was to be held in Vienna at the same time as the International Socialist Congress. She also had work to do in other fields. In the middle of June the International Socialist Bureau decided to call a conference in Brussels of representatives of eleven organisations of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party representing all shades of opinion in order to discuss the differences that prevailed and to establish unity. It was clear, however, that the conference would not be confined to this question and that the liquidators, the Trotskyists, the Bundists and others would take advantage of the occasion in order to try to restrict the activities of the Bolsheviks and to

bind them by a number of decisions. In Russia the influence of the Bolsheviks was growing. As Comrade Badayev points out in his book, *The Bolsheviks in the Tsarist Duma*, in the summer of 1914 the Bolsheviks had the majority on the executive committees of fourteen out of the eighteen trade unions in St. Petersburg. The stronger unions, including the Metal Workers' Union which was the largest and strongest union in St. Petersburg, was on the side of the Bolsheviks. The same thing was evident among the workers' groups in the insurance organisations. Of the Insurance Fund delegates elected in St. Petersburg and Moscow, thirty-seven were Bolsheviks and only seven were Mensheviks, and of the delegates elected to the All-Russian Insurance Fund Committee, forty-seven were Bolsheviks and ten were Mensheviks. The election of delegates to the International Congress in Vienna was well organised. The majority of the workers' organisations elected Bolsheviks.

The preparations for the Party Congress were also proceeding successfully. "The task that confronted us," writes Badayev in his book, "namely, to strengthen and widen the local Party cells before the congress, was fulfilled to a large extent, thanks to the tremendous upsurge that had taken place in the revolutionary movement in the country during the past few months. The workers' swing towards the Party increased; new cadres of revolutionary-minded workers joined the Party organisation. The work of leading the Party groups was constantly improving. Thanks to this the forthcoming congress and the questions on its agenda were assured of the close attention of the Party masses."<sup>\*</sup>

Badayev collected considerable sums of money for the fund for organising the congress. He had already received a number of mandates and resolutions on questions to be raised at the congress, instructions to delegates, etc. He vividly describes how all the illegal work was interwoven with legal activities. He writes as follows:

"Summer presented us with an opportunity of organising illegal meetings outside of the city, in the woods, where we were comparatively safe from police raids. When it was necessary to call more or less general meetings they were

\* A. E. Badayev, *The Bolsheviks in the Tsarist Duma*, p. 189.

arranged under the guise of excursions to the country in the name of some educational society. After leaving St. Petersburg a couple of dozen versts behind we would go 'for a walk' into the depth of the forest. We would then place patrols who would direct the way only by a previously arranged password and then we would hold our meeting . . . Spies, in great numbers, surrounded all the labour organisations, paying particular attention to well-known centres which carried on Party work, such as the editorial office of the *Pravda* and the rooms where our fraction met. But while the activity of the secret police increased we managed to improve our technique of secrecy. There were, of course, arrests of single comrades but no general arrests occurred."

Thus, the line followed by the Central Committee to develop the issue of legal publications, to give them a definite direction, to develop the work of the Duma fraction inside and outside of the Duma, to present all questions clearly and distinctly and to combine legal with illegal work, proved to be absolutely correct.

The attempt on the part of the International Socialist Bureau to prevent this line from being pursued and to hinder this work enraged Ilyich. He decided not to go to the Brussels Unity Conference. Inessa was to go. She spoke French like a native, never got confused and had a strong will. She could be depended upon not to surrender the position. Inessa lived in Trieste and Ilyich sent her a report of the Central Committee which he had drawn up and a number of instructions as to how she was to act in particular circumstances. He thought of and provided for all contingencies. In addition to Inessa the delegation of the Central Committee consisted of M. F. Vladimirsky and N. F. Popov. Inessa was to submit the report of the Central Committee in French. As was to be expected, matters were not limited merely to an exchange of opinion at the conference. Kautsky, in the name of the Bureau, submitted a resolution disapproving of the split and declaring that there were no important differences of opinion between the various fractions. All voted for the resolution except the delegates of the Central Committee and the Lettish comrades who refused to vote in

\* *Ibid.*, p. 190.



spite of Huysmans' threat that he would report to the Vienna Congress, that those who did not vote must be held responsible for disrupting the attempt to bring about unity.

At a private conference in Brussels the liquidators, the Trotskyists, the *Vperyod*-ists, the Plekhanovists and the Caucasian District Organisation formed a *bloc* against the Bolsheviks. This *bloc* decided to take advantage of the situation which had arisen in order to bring pressure on the Bolsheviks.

Besides the Brussels unity business, Ilyich's attention in the summer of 1914 was concentrated on another very serious affair, i.e. the Malinovsky affair.

General Junkovsky was appointed Vice Minister of the Interior and he discovered that Malinovsky was in the employ of the secret police. He reported this to Rodzyanko, the President of the Duma, and pointed out to him that as Malinovsky was a member of the Duma this would lead to a grave political scandal if it became publicly known. On May 8th Malinovsky handed in his resignation from the Duma to Rodzyanko and informed the members of the Social-Democratic fraction of this. The reason he gave for his resignation was "private affairs," but he did not say what these affairs were. After resigning he went abroad. The local and central Party organisations condemned Malinovsky's action as anarchistic and disruptive and expelled him from the Party. The charge that Malinovsky was a *Provocateur* seemed so monstrous that the Central Committee appointed a special commission under the chairmanship of Donetsky, and including Lenin and Zinoviev, to inquire into it. Rumours about Malinovsky being an *agent provocateur* had been circulating for a long time. These rumours came from Menshevik circles. Elena Fedorovna Rozmirovich had strong suspicions in connection with her arrest—she had worked with the Duma fraction. The gendarmes who questioned her possessed information about details which they could have obtained only from spies inside the organisation. Bukharin also had certain information about Malinovsky's conduct. Vladimir Ilyich thought it utterly impossible for Malinovsky to have been an *agent provocateur*. Only once did a doubt flash across his mind.

I remember one day in Poronino, we were returning from the Zinovievs and talked about these rumours. Suddenly Ilyich stopped on the little bridge that we were crossing and said: "It may be true!" and his face expressed anxiety. "What are you talking about, it's nonsense," I answered deprecatingly. Ilyich calmed down and began to abuse the Mensheviks, saying that they were unscrupulous as to the means they employed in the struggle against the Bolsheviks. He had no other doubts on this question.

The commission investigated all the rumours about Malinovsky; they heard Burtzev's opinion that the accusation was improbable and questioned Bukharin and Rozmirovich; but they could not obtain any definite proof of the charge.

Completely knocked out of action and in a state of suspense Malinovsky idled about Poronino. No one knows what he lived through during this time. Then he disappeared, nobody knew where. His true character was definitely revealed after the February Revolution. After the October Revolution he voluntarily returned to Russia, gave himself up to the Soviet government and was tried and sentenced to death by the Supreme Revolutionary Tribunal.

Meanwhile the struggle in Russia became more acute. The strike movement was spreading, particularly in Baku. The masses of the workers supported the Baku strikers. In St. Petersburg the police shot into a crowd of 12,000 Putilov workers. Conflicts with the police were becoming more fierce. The Duma deputies were becoming leaders of the rising proletariat. Mass strikes became the order of the day. On July 7th, 130,000 workers came out on strike in St. Petersburg. The proletariat was preparing for battle. The strikes did not subside; on the contrary they grew in intensity. Barricades were thrown up on the streets of red St. Petersburg.

Then the war broke out.

On August 1st Germany declared war on Russia. On August 3rd she declared war on France; on August 4th she declared war on Belgium and on the same day England declared war on her. On August 6th Austria declared war on Russia; on August 11th France and England declared war on Austria.

The world war had begun and for a time checked the growing revolutionary movement in Russia. It upset the whole world. It gave rise to a number of profound crises ; it raised the most important problems of the revolutionary struggle in a new and sharper form; it brought out the whole of the proletariat as the leaders of all the toilers; it roused new sections of society to the struggle; it made the victory of the proletariat a question of life or death for Russia.

## THE YEARS OF THE WAR TO THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION (1914-17)

CRACOW (1914)

Although war had long been in the air, when it was actually declared it came as a shock to all. We had to leave Poronino, but had as yet no idea where to go. Lilina was very ill at the time, and Zinoviev could not leave anyhow. At that time they lived in Zakopane where physicians were available. We therefore decided to stay for the time being in Poronino. Ilyich wrote to Kobetzky at Copenhagen asking to be kept informed, to establish connections with Stockholm, etc. The local mountain population was utterly depressed when mobilisation began. No one had any clear idea whom the war was against and why it was being fought; there was no enthusiasm, and men went as if led to slaughter. Our hostess, the owner of the cottage, a peasant woman, was crushed with grief; her husband was drafted for the war. From the pulpit the Catholic priest tried to rouse patriotic sentiments. All sorts of rumours began to spread, and the six-year-old boy of a neighbouring poor family who had been hanging around our house, informed me with an air of mystery that the Russians—so the priest said—were putting poison into the wells.

On August 7th the quartermaster of the local *gendarmes* came to our house accompanied by a witness, a local peasant armed with a rifle, to make a search. The officer did not quite know what he was to search for, fumbled in the book-case, found an unloaded Browning pistol, took several note-books containing statistics on the agrarian problem and asked a few insignificant questions. The witness, in a state of embarrassment, sat on the edge of a chair and looked about in a perplexed manner. The *gendarme* officer poked fun at him and, pointing to a jar of paste, said it was a bomb. Then the officer said that there was a formal complaint against Vladimir Ilyich, and that he really should arrest him, but since he would have to deliver the prisoner to-morrow morning to Nowy Targ, the nearest town where military authorities

were stationed, it would be just as well for Ilyich to report in the morning in time to board the six o'clock train. The danger of arrest was obvious, and in war time, during the first days of the war, they could easily put him out of the way. Vladimir Ilyich went to see Ganetsky, who also lived in Poronino, and told him of what had taken place. Ganetsky immediately telegraphed to the Social-Democratic deputy Mareck, and Vladimir Ilyich telegraphed to the police in Cracow, where he was known as a political exile. Ilyich was worried how mother and I would stay alone in the big house in Poronino. He arranged that our Comrade Tichomirnov should live with us in the upper room. Tichomirnov had returned recently from exile in Olonetsk, and the editorial committee of *Pravda* sent him to Poronino to regain his health which had been shattered during his exile, also incidentally to help Ilyich prepare data in connection with the current campaigns for the labour press, etc.—on the basis of material printed in *Pravda*.

Ilyich and I stayed up all night. We could not sleep, the situation was so alarming. In the morning I saw him off and came back to an empty room. On the same day, Ganetsky hired a cart to take him to Novy Targ. There he succeeded in seeing the regional commander; he made a great fuss, told the commander that Ilyich was a member of the International Socialist Bureau, a man for whom many would intercede and for whose life he, the commander, would have to answer. He also saw the public prosecutor, told him who Ilyich was, and obtained permission for me to see him on the very next day. When Ganetsky returned from Novy Targ we both composed a letter to Vienna to Victor Adler, member of the International Bureau and Social-Democratic deputy in the Austrian Parliament. At Novy Targ I was permitted to see Ilyich. We were left alone, but Ilyich spoke little—the situation was still quite confused. The police of Cracow telegraphed that there were no grounds for suspecting Ulyanov of espionage. A similar telegram was sent by Mareck from Zakopane, and a well-known Polish writer came to Novy Targ to intercede on behalf of Ilyich. When he heard of Ilyich's arrest, Zinoviev, who lived in Zakopane, despite the pouring rain, cycled to see the old member of

the Narodnaya Volya Party, the Polish Dr. Dlussky, who lived ten miles from Zakopane. Dlussky immediately hired a carriage and went to Zakopane, where he did considerable telegraphing and letter-writing and then went somewhere to conduct negotiations. I was permitted to visit Ilyich daily. Early in the morning I would leave on the six o'clock train for Novy Targ, an hour's ride, then until eleven o'clock I would wander about the station, the post office and the market-place, and then have an hour's interview with Vladimir Ilyich. Ilyich spoke to me about his prison mates. There were many local peasants in the prison—some for carrying passports whose legal date had expired, others for non-payment of taxes, and others because they had fallen foul of the local authorities. Among the prisoners there was a Frenchman, a Polish petty official who travelled on someone else's reduced rate ticket for the sake of economy, a gypsy who called to his wife from the prison-yard across the wall where the woman would come at a set hour. Ilyich recalled that when he was in exile in Shushenskoye he used to give legal advice to the local peasants whom he got out of all kinds of difficulties, and in the prison he set up an improvised legal advice bureau, writing petitions, etc. His prison mates nicknamed Ilyich "Bitchiy Khlop," meaning "sturdy peasant." "Bitchiy Khlop" became acclimatised to the prison at Novy Targ and was more alert and calm at our meetings. In this criminal prison, at night when the inmates were asleep, he made plans for the further course of the Party, the measures that would have to be taken in order to turn the world war into a world conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. I told Ilyich the news of the war that I had succeeded in obtaining.

I did not tell him the following: once while returning from the railway station I heard some peasant women coming out of the Catholic church discussing aloud—apparently for my benefit—how they would deal with spies. Even if the authorities released the spy, the peasants would put his eyes out, cut off his tongue, etc. It was clear that we could not remain in Poronino after Ilyich was set free. I began packing up, sorting out things that we must take along, and those that we might leave in Poronino. Our household went to pieces.

Our servant, whom we had to hire for the summer because of mother's illness, had been telling the neighbours all kinds of fables about us, about our connections with Russia, so I managed to ship her off as fast as I could to Cracow, where she yearned to go, paying her fare and wages in advance. Our neighbour's little girl helped us to tend the stove and buy provisions. My mother—she was already 72 years old—was very ill. She saw that something was wrong but could not understand just what it was. Although I had told her that Vladimir Ilyich was under arrest, at times she would say that he had been drafted for the war. She became agitated every time I left the house, thinking I would disappear in the same way as Vladimir Ilyich. Tichomirnov, who lived with us, kept on smoking pensively and packing books. Once I had to get a certain certificate from the same peasant-witness whom the *gendarme*-officer had made fun of when our house was searched. I went to see him in his house at the end of the village, a typical poor-peasant's house, and we had a long talk about the war, about the people who were fighting in the war, and those who were interested in it. He then saw me home in a friendly manner.

Finally, the pressure exerted by the deputy from Vienna, Victor Adler, and the Lvov deputy Diamond, who both vouched for Vladimir Ilyich, had its effect. On August 19th Vladimir Ilyich was released. I went to Novy Targ in the morning as usual, but this time I was even admitted into the prison to help gather up Ilyich's things. We hired a cart and went to Poronino. There we were forced to stay for another week before we succeeded in getting a permit to move to Cracow. In Cracow we went to the same landlady from whom Kamenev and Inessa had once rented rooms. Half the house had been converted into a military hospital, but she managed to find a nook for us. She had not much time for us, by the way. A battle had been fought recently at Krasnik in which two of her sons had participated, and she had no news from them.

On the next day we witnessed a horrible scene from the window of our room. A train had arrived from Krasnik, bringing dead and wounded soldiers. Relatives of the men who had taken part in the battle ran after the stretcher-

bearers and looked into the faces of the dead and dying, afraid to recognise their kin. Those who had been less seriously wounded came slowly from the railway station, with bandaged heads and arms. People who met the train helped them carry their baggage, offered them food and jugs of beer obtained from near-by restaurants. One could not help thinking: "Here it is war!" And this was only the first battle.

In Cracow it did not take us long to obtain permission to go abroad to a neutral country, Switzerland. We had some matters to arrange. Not long before this my mother had become a "capitalist." Her sister, a school teacher, died in Novotcherkask and left her all her property—silver spoons, icons, some dresses and four thousand rubles saved up in the course of thirty years of teaching. The money was deposited in a Cracow bank. To get it from there it was necessary to resort to the services of a banker in Vienna who obtained the money, retaining exactly half of it for his services. During the war we lived mainly on this money, with such economy that when we came back to Russia in 1917 some of it was still left, and this sum, taken from us during a raid in Petersburg in July 1917, was offered as evidence that Vladimir Ilyich had received money from the German government as a reward for espionage.

It took us a whole week to travel from Cracow to the Swiss frontier. We stopped for long periods at railway stations to let military trains pass. We observed the chauvinist agitation conducted by nuns and other women grouped around them. At the railway stations they distributed small images, prayer books and similar articles among the soldiers. Smartly dressed military men were at all railway stations. The cars were decorated with various slogans as to what to do with the French, the English, the Russians: "jeden Russ ein Schuss!" (a shot for every Russian!). At one of the sidings stood several cars loaded with insect powder; the cars were destined for the front.

In Vienna we stopped for a day to get the necessary papers, to arrange money matters, to telegraph to Switzerland for someone to vouch for us, so that we might enter the country. We were vouched for by Greulich, oldest member of the Swiss



Social-Democratic Party. In Vienna, Riazanov took Vladimir Ilyich to see Victor Adler who had helped to secure Ilyich's release. Adler told us of his conversation with the Minister. The latter had asked: "Are you certain that Ulyanov is an enemy of the Tsarist government?"—"Oh, yes," Adler answered, "a more implacable enemy than your Excellency." From Vienna to the Swiss frontier we proceeded quite rapidly.

#### BERNE (1914-15)

On September 5th we finally entered Switzerland and went to Berne.

We were not yet finally decided where we would live, in Geneva or Berne. Ilyich was drawn to the old hearth, to his accustomed spot in Geneva where it used to be so convenient to work at the "Societe de Lecture," which had a good Russian library. But our friends in Berne maintained that Geneva had changed considerably and was crowded with exiles from other cities and from France, and that the usual emigre atmosphere pervaded there. Without deciding the matter definitely, we took a room in Berne for the time being.

Ilyich began corresponding with Geneva to ascertain whether any people were going to Russia—they had to be utilised for establishing contact with Russia; he enquired whether there was still a Russian printing office in Geneva, whether it would be possible to publish Russian leaflets, etc.

On the day following our arrival from Galicia a conference was held of all the Bolsheviks present at that time in Berne—Shklovsky, the Safarovs, the Duma-deputy Samoilov, Mokhov and others. At that conference, held in the woods, Ilyich expounded his views on current events. As a result of the conference a resolution was adopted characterising the war as an imperialist predatory war and branding the conduct of the leaders of the Second International who had voted for war credits as treason to the cause of the proletariat.

The resolution\* stated that "from the standpoint of the working class and the toiling masses of all the peoples in Russia by far the lesser evil would be a defeat of the tsarist monarchy and its armies which oppress Poland, the Ukraine

\* Lenin: *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, p. 61.

and a number of nationalities in Russia." The resolution launched the slogan of conducting propaganda in all countries for a Socialist revolution, civil war and a determined struggle against chauvinism and patriotism in all countries without exception. At the same time the resolution outlined a programme of action for Russia: struggle against the monarchy, propaganda for revolution, struggle for a republic, for the emancipation of nationalities oppressed by the "Great Russians," for the confiscation of the estates of the nobility and for the eight-hour day.

The Berne resolution was in its substance a challenge to the entire capitalist world. The Berne resolution was, of course, not written for the purpose of being pigeon-holed. It was first of all sent to all Bolshevik sections abroad. Then Samoilov took the thesis with him for discussion with the Russian part of the Central Committee and with the Duma fraction. It was not yet certain what position they took. Connections with Russia were interrupted. Only later it became known that the Russian part of the Central Committee and the Bolshevik part of the Duma fraction struck the right note from the very outset. For the advanced workers of our country, for our Party organisation the resolutions of international congresses about war were not merely scraps of paper, they were guides to action.

During the very first days of the war, when mobilisation was declared, the St. Petersburg Committee issued a leaflet with the slogan: "Down with War! War against War!" A number of industrial enterprises in St. Petersburg declared a strike on the day the reserves were mobilised, and an effort was even made to hold a demonstration. But the war called forth such an orgy of mob-patriotism and military reaction was so greatly strengthened that not much could be accomplished. Our Duma fraction firmly held to the line of struggle against the war, the line of continued struggle against the tsarist rule. This firmness created an impression even upon the Mensheviks, and the Social-Democratic fraction as a whole adopted a resolution which was read from the Duma tribune. The resolution was couched in cautious terms, much was left unsaid; still, it was a resolution of protest and aroused general indignation among the rest of

the members of the Duma. The indignation increased when the Social-Democratic fraction (still as a whole) abstained from voting on war credits and left the Chamber in a body as a demonstration of protest. The Bolshevik organisation quickly went deep underground, began issuing leaflets with instructions on how to utilise the war in the interests of developing and deepening the revolutionary struggle. Anti-war propaganda was started in the provinces. Reports from the localities indicated that the propaganda found support among the revolutionary-minded workers. Of all this we learned abroad much later.

In our groups abroad, which had not experienced the revolutionary upsurge of the preceding months in Russia, and were weary of the emigre atmosphere from which they sought to escape at all costs, there was not the firmness shown by our Duma deputies, and by the Russian Bolshevik organisations.

In Paris our Bolshevik group wavered. Although the majority of the group expressed themselves against the war and against volunteering, some of the comrades—Sapozhkov (Kuznetsov), Kazakov (Britman, Svyagin), Misha Edisherov (Davidov), Moissejev (Ilya, Zefir) and others joined the French army as volunteers. The Bolshevik, the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary volunteers (about 80 in all) adopted a declaration in the name of the "Russian Republicans," which was published in the French press. Before the volunteers left Paris Plekhanov made a farewell speech in their honour.

The majority of the Paris group condemned volunteering. But even the other groups were not clear on the question. Vladimir Ilyich realised that at such a serious moment it was particularly important that every Bolshevik should ponder over the significance of the events that were taking place; a comradely interchange of opinion was necessary; it was not expedient to fix every shade of opinion at once, at the very outset. It was necessary to come to a complete understanding. This is why, in answering Karpinsky's letter stating the view-point of the Geneva section, Ilyich wrote: "Would it not be better to make this 'criticism' and my 'anti-criticism' a subject for discussion?"

Ilyich knew that in a comradely discussion it would be easier to arrive at an understanding than through correspondence. But of course the times were not such as would permit the matter to be limited to comradely discussions in a narrow circle of Bolsheviks.

Early in October it became known that upon his return from Paris Plekhanov had delivered a lecture in Geneva and was preparing to deliver a lecture at Lausanne.

Plekhanov's position troubled Vladimir Ilyich. He both believed and did not believe that Plekhanov had turned *oboronetz*.\* "It is simply impossible to believe," he would say, and add pensively: "it must be the effect of Plekhanov's military past!" When on October 10th a telegram came from Lausanne to the effect that the lecture was scheduled for the next day, the 11th, Ilyich got busy preparing for it, and I tried to free him from other affairs, to arrange with our people as to who would go from Berne, etc. . . .

I could not go to the lecture, and was told about it in detail later. But having read in the *Notes of the Lenin Institute* F. Ilyin's memoirs about that lecture, and knowing what it meant at that time to Ilyich, I can picture to myself quite vividly what happened. Inessa, too, later related to me what occurred. Our people came to the lecture from all over Switzerland. . . . Ilyich feared he might not be able to get in . . . to say all the things he had to say; the Mensheviks might not admit so many Bolsheviks . . . I clearly recall how, amidst the bustle of the dinner table at the Movshoviches one day, Ilyich was so absorbed in himself, so agitated, that he could not swallow a bite. . . .

With the first part of the lecture in which Plekhanov attacked the Germans, Ilyich was in agreement and he applauded. In the second part, Plekhanov developed the defence of the fatherland point of view. There could no longer be any doubt as to where Plekhanov stood. Ilyich asked for the floor. No one else did. Carrying a glass of beer in his hand he approached the speaker's table. He spoke calmly, and only the pallor of his face betrayed his excitement. In his speech he said in effect that the outbreak

\* Literally "defencist," i.e. supporting the imperialist war under cover of the slogan "defence of the fatherland."—Ed.

of the war was no accident, that the whole nature of the development of bourgeois society had laid the basis for the war. The International Socialist Congresses—at Stuttgart, Copenhagen and Basle had laid down what the attitude of Socialism was to be towards impending war. The Social-Democrats would be fulfilling their duty only when they waged a struggle against the chauvinist intoxication in their own countries. It was necessary to turn the war, which had just begun, into a conflict between the proletariat and the ruling class. (*Collected Works*, XVIII, p. 65).

Ilyich had only ten minutes. He expressed only the essentials. Plekhanov, with his usual sharpness of wit, made the rebuttal. The Mensheviks—they were in an overwhelming majority—applauded him violently. The impression was created that Plekhanov was victorious.

On October 14th, three days later, in the same place where Plekhanov had delivered his lecture—in the Maison du Peuple (People's House), Ilyich was scheduled to deliver a lecture. The hall was packed. The lecture was successful, Ilyich was in high, militant spirits. He fully developed his view-point concerning the war as an imperialist war. He pointed out that in Russia a leaflet had already been issued by the Central Committee against the war, that a similar leaflet had been issued by the Caucasian organisation and other groups. The best Socialist paper in Europe at that time, he said, was *Golos (the Voice)* to which Martov contributed: "I have often strongly disagreed with Martov," he said. "All the more definitely therefore must I say that this writer at present is doing what a Social-Democrat should do. He criticises his own government, he exposes the bourgeoisie in his own country, he rails against his ministers."

In private conversation Ilyich more than once remarked how good it would be if Martov came over to our side. But he did not believe that Martov would long remain in the position he had taken. He knew how easily Martov fell under other people's influence. "He writes so while he is alone," Ilyich added. Ilyich's lecture was a tremendous success. He repeated this lecture, "The Proletariat and the War," later at Geneva. (*Collected Works*, XVIII p. 67).

When he returned from his lecture trip Ilyich found a letter from Shlyapnikov informing him from Stockholm of the work in Russia, of Vandervelde's telegram to the Social-Democratic fraction in the Duma and of the replies of the Menshevist and Bolshevik deputies. When war was declared Emile Vandervelde, Belgian delegate on the International Socialist Bureau, accepted a ministerial post in the Belgian government. Not long before the war he had been in Russia and saw the struggle that the workers of Russia waged against the tsarist autocracy, but had not understood its depths. Vandervelde telegraphed to both groups of the Social-Democratic Duma fraction, calling upon the fraction to help the Russian government conduct a determined war against Germany.

The Menshevist deputies who at first refused to vote for war credits wavered considerably when they learned of the position taken by the majority of the Socialist parties, and so their reply to Vandervelde showed a complete change of front. They declared that they would not oppose the war. The Bolshevik fraction sent a reply vigorously rejecting any suggestion of supporting the war and discontinuing the struggle against the tsarist government. Much was left unsaid in the reply, but the basic line was correctly laid down. The importance of maintaining contact with Russia was evident, and Ilyich more strongly than ever insisted that Shlyapnikov remain in Stockholm and strengthen connections with the Duma fraction and the Russians in general. This could best be accomplished through Stockholm.

As soon as Ilyich came to Berne from Cracow he wrote to Karpinsky, inquiring whether it would be possible to print a leaflet in Geneva. The theses adopted during the first days after our arrival in Berne were, by a decision taken a month later, to be recast and published in the form of a manifesto. Ilyich renewed the correspondence with Karpinsky about publishing the leaflet, sending letters by trusted messengers as occasion offered and keeping the matter very secret. At that time it was not yet clear what position the Swiss government would take toward anti-militarist propaganda.

On the next day after receiving Shlyapnikov's letter Vladimir Ilyich wrote to Karpinsky :

"Dear K: While I was in Geneva glad news came from Russia. The text of the reply of the Russian Social-Democrats to Vandervelde also arrived. We therefore decided instead of a separate manifesto to publish a paper to be called the *Sotsial Demokrat*, Central Organ . . . . . By Monday we will send you some slight corrections to the manifesto and a *different* signature (for after communication with Russia we are coming out officially)."

At the end of October Ilyich again went on a lecture tour, first visiting Montreux and then Zurich. At his Zurich lecture Trotsky spoke and was indignant because Ilyich had called Kautsky "traitor." But Ilyich had deliberately put every question in the sharpest manner in order to bring out clearly everyone's position. The struggle with the defencists was in full swing.

This struggle was not merely an internal Party struggle and touched not only Russian matters. It was a struggle of international character.

"The Second International died, vanquished by opportunism," Ilyich maintained. It was necessary to gather forces for the Third International, purged of opportunism.

But what forces could be relied upon?

The only Social-Democratic members of Parliament who refused to vote for war credits besides the Russians were the Serbians. There were only two in the Skupshchina (Serbian Parliament). In Germany, on the outbreak of the war, all the Social-Democratic members of the Reichstag voted for war credits, but as early as September 10th Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg and Clara Zetkin drew up a declaration of protest against the position taken by the majority of the German Social-Democrats. This declaration they succeeded in publishing in the Swiss newspapers only at the end of October, and in the German press they could not publish it at all. Of the German papers the Bremen *Burgerzeitung* from the very beginning of the war took the furthest position to the left, stating on August 23rd that the "proletarian international" was destroyed. In France the Socialist Party with Guesde and Vaillant at the head

slipped in chauvinism. But in the lower ranks of the Party anti-war sentiment was quite widespread. For the Belgian party Vandervelde's conduct was typical. In England the chauvinism of Hyndman and the British Socialist Party was opposed by MacDonald and Keir Hardie of the opportunist Independent Labour Party. In the neutral countries there was anti-war sentiment, but it was mainly of a pacifist nature. The most revolutionary was the Italian Socialist Party with its paper *Avanti* at the head; it opposed chauvinism and exposed the predatory aims that were behind the appeals for war. It was supported by the great majority of the advanced workers. On September 27th an Italo-Swiss Socialist Conference took place at Lugano. Our theses on the war were sent to this conference. The conference characterised the war as an imperialist war and called upon the international proletariat to fight for peace.

In general, the voices raised against chauvinism, the international voices, still sounded weak, disjointed, uncertain, but Ilyich did not doubt that they would grow stronger and stronger. During the entire autumn he was in high militant spirits.

The memory of that autumn is interwoven in my mind with the autumnal scene of the forest at Berne. The autumn of that year was a glorious one. We lived in Berne on Distelweg, a small, tidy, quiet street adjoining the Berne forest which extended for several kilometres. Across the road lived Inessa, five minutes' walk—the Zinovievs, ten minutes' walk—the Shklovskys. We would wander for hours along the forest roads, bestrewn with fallen yellow leaves. On most occasions the three of us went together on these walks, Vladimir Ilyich, Inessa and myself. Vladimir Ilyich would develop his plans of the international struggle. Inessa took it all very much to heart. In this unfolding struggle she began to take a most direct part, conducting correspondence, translating our documents into French and English, gathering materials, talking with people, etc. Sometimes we would sit for hours on the sunlit, wooded mountain-side while Ilyich jotted down outlines of his speeches and articles and polished his formulations. I studied Italian



with the aid of a Toussain text-book, and Inessa sewed a skirt and basked with delight in the autumnal sun—she had not yet fully recovered from the effects of her imprisonment. In the evening we would all gather in Gregory's (Zinoviev's) little room (the three of them, Gregory, Lilina and their little boy Styopa lived in one room) and after a little bantering with Styopa before the boy went to sleep, Ilyich would make a series of concrete proposals.

The main points of the line of struggle Ilyich formulated in a condensed, precise manner in his letter to Shlyapnikov of October 17th:

" . . . Kautsky is now *more harmful than all of them*. No words can describe how dangerous and mean are his sophisms which cover up the rascality of the opportunists (in the *Neue Zeit* [*New Era*]) with smooth and slick phrases. The opportunists are an open evil; the German centre with Kautsky at its head a hidden evil embellished for diplomatic purposes and dulling the eyes, the intelligence, and the consciousness of the workers, is more dangerous than anything else. Our task at present is a determined and open struggle against international opportunism and those who shield it (Kautsky). This is what we are going to do in the Central Organ which we shall soon issue (probably two pages). One must exert every effort to uphold the just hatred of the class-conscious workers for the hideous conduct of the Germans; one must draw from this hatred political conclusions against opportunism and against every concession to opportunism. This is an international task. It develops upon us; there is nobody else. One cannot shirk it. The slogan of 'simply' re-establishing the International is incorrect (because the danger of a spineless conciliatory resolution along the line of Kautsky and Vandervelde is very, very great!). The slogan of 'peace' is incorrect, as the slogan must be: changing the national war into civil war. (This change may take a long time, it may and will demand a number of preliminary conditions, but all the work must be conducted *along the line of such* a change, in this spirit and in this direction). It is not the sabotaging of the war, not undertaking sporadic individual acts in this direction, but the conducting of mass propaganda (and not only among 'civilians') that leads to the

transformation of the war into civil war. "In Russia, chauvinism hides behind phrases about *La Belle France* and unfortunate Belgium (how about the Ukraine and others?), or behind the 'popular' hatred for the Germans (and 'Kaiserism'). It is therefore our absolute duty to struggle against these sophisms. In order that the struggle may proceed along a definite and clear line, one must have a slogan that summarises it. This slogan is: For us *Russians*, from the point of view of the interests of the labouring masses and the working class of *Russia*, there can not be the slightest doubt, absolutely no doubt whatever, that the *lesser* evil would be, here and now, the defeat of tsarism in the present war. For tsarism is a hundred times worse than Kaiserism. We do not sabotage the war, but we struggle against chauvinism, all propaganda and agitation being directed towards international unification (drawing together, expressing solidarity, reaching agreements *selon les circonstances\**) of the proletariat in the interests of civil war. It would also be erroneous both to appeal for *individual* acts of firing at officers, and to allow arguments like the one which says: We do not want to help Kaiserism. The former is a deviation towards anarchism, the latter towards opportunism. As to ourselves, we must prepare a mass (at least a collective) action in the army, not of one nation alone, and conduct *all* the work of propaganda and agitation in this direction. To direct the work (stubborn, systematic work that may require a long time) in the spirit of transforming the national war into civil war—this is the whole issue. The moment for such a transformation is a different question; at present it is not yet clear. We must allow this moment to ripen, we must systematically 'force it to ripen.'.....The peace slogan is in my judgment incorrect at the present moment. This is a philistine's, a preacher's slogan. The proletarian slogan must be civil war.

"Objectively, from the fundamental change in the situation of Europe, there follows such a slogan for the epoch of mass war. The same slogan follows from the Basle resolution.

\* According to circumstances.—*Ed*

"We can neither 'promise' civil war nor 'decree it,' but it is our duty to work *in this direction*, if need be, for a very long time. You will find details in the article in the Central Organ."<sup>\*</sup>

Two and a half months after the beginning of the war, Ilyich had already hammered out a clear, distinct line of struggle. This line guided all of his subsequent activity. The international range of his activity gave a new tone to his work for Russia, it gave him fresh vigour, new colour. Had it not been for the many years of hard work previously given to building the Party, to organising the working class of Russia, Ilyich would not have been able so quickly and so firmly to take a correct line respecting new problems raised by the imperialist war. Had he not been in the thick of the international struggle, he would not have been able so firmly to lead the Russian proletariat towards the October victory.

Number 33 of the Sotsial-Demokrat was published on November 1st, 1914. At first only 500 copies were printed, but later it was found necessary to print another 1,000. On November 14th Ilyich joyfully informed Karpinsky that the paper had been delivered to one of the points not far from the border and that soon it would be shipped farther.

With the aid of Naine and Graber a resume of the manifesto was published on November 13th in *La Sentinelle*, a Swiss newspaper, published in French in the workers' centre of Chaux-de-Fonds. Ilyich was jubilant. We sent translations of the manifesto to French, English and German newspapers.

For the purpose of developing propaganda among the French, Vladimir Ilyich communicated with Karpinsky about arranging in Geneva a lecture to be delivered in French by Inessa. He wrote to Shlyapnikov about addressing the Swedish congress. Shlyapnikov did address it and very successfully. Thus little by little the "international action" of the Bolsheviks was unfolded.

As regards connections with Russia the situation was not so good. Shlyapnikov sent some interesting material from St. Petersburg for No. 34 of the paper, but along with it we

<sup>\*</sup> *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 73-75.

had to publish in that issue the news about the arrest of the five Bolshevik Duma deputies. The connection with Russia again became weaker.

While developing a passionate struggle against the betrayal of the cause of the proletariat by the Second International, Ilyich at the same time began, immediately upon his arrival in Berne, preparing an essay on "Karl Marx"\* for *Granat's Encyclopedic Dictionary*. In this essay he begins by explaining his exposition of the teachings of Marx with an explanation of his philosophy, dividing it into two parts: "Philosophical Materialism" and "Dialectics," and then, after explaining Marx's economic theories, he shows how Marx approached the question of Socialism and the tactics of the class struggle of the proletariat.

This was not the usual way of presenting Marx's teachings. Before writing the chapters on philosophical materialism and dialectics Ilyich again diligently re-read Hegel and other philosophers and continued these studies even after he had finished the essay. The aim of his work in the realm of philosophy was to master the method of transforming philosophy into a concrete guide to action. His brief remarks about the dialectical approach toward all phenomena, made in 1921 in the course of the controversies with Trotsky and Bukharin concerning the trade unions, are the best evidence of how much Ilyich had gained in this respect from his studies in philosophy begun upon his arrival in Berne and constituting a continuation of what he had accomplished in the matter of philosophic studies in 1908-09, when he fought with the *Machists*.

Struggle and study, study and scientific work were always for Ilyich strongly bound together. Although at first sight they may have appeared to be only parallel work, there was always the closest and most profound connection between them.

In the beginning of 1915 the strenuous work of consolidating the Bolshevik groups abroad was continued. Although a definite understanding had already been reached among them the times were such that a cemented whole was needed

\* Little Lenin Library, No. 1, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI.

more than ever. Before the war the centre of the Bolshevik groups, the so-called Committee of Organisations Abroad, had had its headquarters in Paris. Now the centre had to be moved to Switzerland, a neutral country, to Berne, where the editorial board of the Central Organ was located. Agreement had to be reached on all points—the appraisal of the war, the new tasks confronting the Party, the ways of meeting them; the work of the groups had to be made more exact. The Bojio group, for instance (Krylenko, Bukharin, Rozmirovich) decided to publish their own organ abroad, the *Zvezda* (*Star*), and they went about it in such a hurried fashion that they did not even arrange the matter with the Central Organ. We learned about this plan from Inessa. Such a publication was to little purpose. There was no money even to publish the Central Organ, and although there were no differences of opinion so far, such might easily arise. Any uncautious phrase might be caught up by opponents and exaggerated in every way. It was necessary to keep in step. Such were the times.

At the end of February a conference of all groups abroad was called in Berne.\* Besides the Swiss groups there was the group from Paris. The Parisians sent Grisha Belenky, who reported in detail about the defencist sentiments which prevailed in the Paris group in the beginning of the war. The Londoners could not come and assigned their mandate to a proxy. The Bojio group were hesitant about attending and came only toward the end. Together with them came the "Japanese," our nickname for the Kievites, Comrades Piatakov and Bosche (sister of E. F. Rozmirovich) who had escaped from Siberia by way of Japan and America. That was the time when we clutched convulsively at every new person who was at one with our idea. The "Japanese" made a good impression on us. Their arrival undoubtedly strengthened our forces abroad.

The conference adopted a clear-cut resolution on the war; there was a debate on the slogan of a United States of Europe (opposed with particular heat by Inessa); the character of the work of the groups abroad was mapped out; it was decided

\* See *Selected Works*, Vol. V., pp. 131-141.

not to publish the paper at Bojio. A new Committee of Organisations Abroad was elected, consisting of the Berne comrades Shklovsky, Kaparov, Inessa, Lilina and Krupskaya.

The task of the day was to rally our forces on an international scale. The difficulty of this task was made apparent by the Inter-Allied Socialist Conference, consisting of representatives of the Socialist Parties in England, Belgium, France, and Russia which took place in London on February 14th, 1915. The conference was summoned by Vandervelde, but it was organised by the English Independent Labour Party headed by Keir Hardie and MacDonald. Before the conference they had been opposed to the war, and for international unity. At first the Independent Labour Party considered inviting delegates from Germany and Austria, but the French declared that they would not participate in the conference under such circumstances. There were 11 delegates from England, 16 from France, 3 from Belgium. Three Socialist-Revolutionaries came from Russia, and there was one delegate from the Menshevik Organisation Committee. We were to be represented there by Litvinov. One could foresee what kind of conference it would be, what results it would bring, and it was therefore agreed that Litvinov should merely read the declaration of our Central Committee. Ilyich drew up an outline of this declaration for Litvinov. It contained the demand that Vandervelde, Guesde and Sembat resign at once from the bourgeois cabinets of Belgium and France and that all the Socialist parties support the Russian workers in their struggle against tsarism. The declaration stated that the Social-Democrats of Germany and Austria had committed a monstrous crime against Socialism and the International by voting war credits and concluding "civil peace" with the Junkers, priests and bourgeoisie, but that the Belgian and the French Socialists had acted no better. The declaration continued: "The workers of Russia extend their comradely hand to the Socialist who acts like Karl Liebknecht, like the Socialists of Serbia and Italy, like the British comrades in the Independent Labour Party, and certain members of the British Socialist Party, like our arrested comrades of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

"We call upon you to take this road, the road of Socialism.

Down with chauvinism that ruins the proletarian cause !  
Long live international Socialism !"

These were the concluding words of the declaration. It was signed by the Central Committee and also by Berzin, representing the Lettish Social-Democrats. The chairman did not allow Litvinov to read the declaration to the end, and so he handed it to the chairman and left the conference declaring that the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party would not participate in it. After Litvinov's departure the conference adopted a resolution which declared support for the "war of liberation" until victory over Germany was achieved. Keir Hardie and Mac Donald also voted for this resolution.

At the same time preparations were going on for an International Women's Conference. It was, of course, important not only that such a conference should take place, but also that it should not be of a pacifist character, and that it should take a definitely revolutionary position. This necessitated much preliminary work, most of which fell to Inessa. As she usually assisted the editors of the Central Organ in translating various documents and had been a participant in the struggle developing against "defencism" from the very beginning, Inessa was very well fitted for this work. Besides, she knew languages. She corresponded with Clara Zetkin, Balabanova, Kollontai, with English women, thus strengthening the threads of the international ties. These threads were very feeble, were constantly breaking, but Inessa kept sturdily at her task. Through Stahl, who lived in Paris, she conducted correspondence with the French comrades. It was easiest of all to communicate with Balabanova. She worked in Italy, and helped to publish the *Avanti*. This was the period when the revolutionary spirit of the Italian Socialist Party was at its height. In Germany anti-defencist sentiments were spreading. On December 2nd Karl Liebknecht voted against war credits. The International Women's Conference was summoned by Clara Zetkin. She was the secretary of the International Bureau of Socialist Women. Together with Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring she fought against the chauvinist majority in the German Social-Democratic Party. It was with her that Inessa communicated. Kollontai had

left the Mensheviks about that time. In January she wrote to Vladimir Ilyich and myself, enclosing a leaflet. "My esteemed and dear comrade," Vladimir Ilyich wrote her in return, "I am very grateful to you for sending the leaflet; at present I can only hand it over to the local members of the editorial body of *Rabotnitsa* (*The Working Woman*). They have already sent a letter to Zetkin, apparently of the same content as yours." And then Vladimir Ilyich proceeded to explain the position of the Bolsheviks. "Apparently you do not entirely agree with the slogan of civil war and assign it, so to speak, a subordinate (and perhaps even a conditional) place to the slogan of peace. And you emphasise that 'we must put forward a *slogan that would unite all*' I will tell you frankly that the thing I fear most at the present time is indiscriminate unity, which, I am convinced, is most dangerous and harmful to the proletariat." It was against the background of Ilyich's position that Inessa conducted her correspondence with Kollontai concerning the Conference. Kollontai did not succeed in getting to the Conference.

The International Conference at Berne took place March 26th-28th. The largest and most organised delegation was the German, headed by Clara Zetkin. The delegates of the Russian Central Committee were Armand, Lilina, Ravich, Krupskaya, Rozmirovich. The Polish "Rozlamovists" were represented by Kamenskaya (Domskaya), who supported the delegation of the Central Committee. The Russians had two more delegates representing the Organisation Committee. Balabanova came from Italy. Louise Simanot, a French woman, was very much under the influence of Balabanova. The Dutch were in a purely pacifist mood. Roland-Holst, who then belonged to the left wing, could not come; a delegate came from the Troelstra\* Party which was thoroughly chauvinist. The English delegates belonged to the opportunist Independent Labour Party, the Swiss delegates were also pacifistically inclined. In fact, pacifism was the predominant mood. Of course, if we bear in mind the London Conference a month and a half earlier, this one marked a considerable step forward. The very fact that the Conference

\* Troelstra was then leader of the Socialist Party of Holland.—*Ed.*



consisted of delegates from countries at war with one another was significant.

The majority of the German women belonged to the Karl Liebknecht Rosa Luxemburg group. This group had begun to dissociate itself from the chauvinists and to fight its government. Rosa Luxemburg had already been arrested. But this was at home. At the International Conference they thought they had to be as conciliatory as possible because they were the delegation from a country which at the moment was winning victories on the battle-front. If the Conference, assembled after so much effort, went to pieces, they thought, all the blame would be placed on them; the chauvinists of all countries, and the German social-patriots above all, would rejoice at the collapse of the conference. Therefore Clara Zetkin was ready to make concessions to the pacifists, which meant watering down the revolutionary content of the resolutions. Our delegation--the delegation of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, assumed the standpoint of Ilyich, as expressed in the letter to Kollontai. The aim was not to achieve indiscriminate unity, but unity for the revolutionary struggle against chauvinism, for the merciless revolutionary struggle of the proletariat against the ruling class. There was no condemnation of chauvinism in the resolution drawn up by the commission consisting of the Germans, English and Dutch. We brought forward our own declaration. It was defended by Inessa. The Polish representative Kamenskaya also spoke in support of it. We remained alone. On all sides our "splitting" policy was denounced. But events soon proved the correctness of our position. The goody-goody pacifism of the English and the Dutch did not advance international action a single step. The important role in hastening the end of the war was played by the revolutionary struggle and rupture with the chauvinists.

Ilyich ardently devoted himself to the mobilisation of the forces for the struggle on the international front. "It does not matter that we now number only a few individuals," he once remarked, "millions will be with us." He drew up our resolution for the Berne Women's Conference and followed all its work. But one felt how difficult it was for him to

remain in the role of a leader behind the scenes in a matter of such great importance that was taking place right in the vicinity and in which he so ardently longed to take a direct part. . . . \*

On April 17th there was another international conference at Berne—a conference of Socialist youth. In Switzerland at that time there were considerable numbers of young men from various belligerent countries, who did not want to go to the front and take part in the imperialist war; they had emigrated to a neutral country, Switzerland. Naturally, these young men were permeated with revolutionary sentiment. It is no accident that the International Women's Conference was followed by the Conference of Socialist Youth. . . .

In March my mother died. She had been a close comrade, helping in all our work. In Russia, during raids, she would hide illegal materials; she would visit comrades in prison and deliver messages; she had lived with us in Siberia and abroad, managing the household, taking care of arriving or departing comrades, sewing "armour" on special skirts and waistcoats in which illegal literature was concealed, writing "skeletons" of letters between the lines of which our messages were written with invisible ink, etc. The comrades loved her. The last winter was a very trying one for her. All her strength gave out. She was yearning to go to Russia, but we had no one there to care for her. She often argued with Vladimir Ilyich, but she was always solicitous about him, and Vladimir, too, was attentive to her. Once mother was in low spirits. She was an inveterate smoker and had forgotten to buy cigarettes; it was a holiday and tobacco could not be obtained anywhere. When Ilyich saw that, he said: "Don't worry, I'll get some at once." He went searching in the cafes, found cigarettes and brought them to mother. Not long before her death mother once said to me: "No, I won't go alone to Russia, I'll wait until I go with you two." At another time she began speaking about religion. She considered herself religious, but had not been to church for years, never observed religious fasts, never prayed, and in general religion did not play any part whatever in her life, but she never

\* Lenin's criticism of the Conference: *Selected Works*, V., p. 222.

liked to discuss the subject, and now she suddenly said: "I was religious in my youth, but as I lived on and learned life I saw it was all nonsense." More than once she had expressed the desire to be cremated when she died. The little house where we lived was situated quite close to the Berne forest. When the warm spring sun began to shine, mother was drawn to the woods. I went with her, we sat on a bench for a half hour, and then she could hardly get back home. Next day she was already in her death agony. We did as she had requested—cremated her at the Berne Crematorium.

Vladimir Ilyich and I waited at the crematorium. In about two hours an attendant brought us a tin box with the ashes still warm and showed us where they were to be buried.

Our family life became still more student-like. Our landlady, a pious old laundress, asked us to look for another room, explaining that she wanted to rent her room to believers. We moved to another room.

On February 10th the trial of the five Duma deputies took place. All the Bolshevik deputies—Petrovsky, Muranov, Badayev, Samoilov, Shagov and also L. B. Kamenev were sentenced to exile.

In the article, "What has the Trial of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Fraction Proved," March 24th, 1915, Ilyich wrote: "The facts tell us that in the very first months after the beginning of the war, the class-conscious vanguard of the workers of Russia rallied, *in practice*, around the Central Committee and the Central Organ. This fact may be unpleasant to one or other of our 'fractions,' still it cannot be denied. The words quoted in the indictment: "It is necessary to direct the armies not against our brothers, the wage slaves of other countries, but against the reaction of the bourgeois governments and parties of all countries"—these words will spread, thanks to the trial, and they have already spread over Russia as an appeal to proletarian internationalism, to proletarian revolution. The class slogan of the vanguard of the workers of Russia has reached, thanks to the trial, the widest masses of the workers.

"An epidemic of chanvinism among the bourgeoisie and one section of the petty bourgeoisie, vacillations in another

section, and a working-class appeal of this nature—this is the actual objective picture of our political divisions. It is to this actual picture, and not to the benevolent wishes of the intelligentsia and founders of little groups, that one has to adapt one's 'prospects,' hopes, slogans.

"The 'Pravdist' papers and the 'Muranov' type\* of work have brought about the unity of four-fifths of the class-conscious workers of Russia. About forty thousand workers bought *Pravda*; many more read it. Let war, prison, Siberia, and hard labour break five times more or ten times more—this section of the workers *cannot* be annihilated. It is alive. It is permeated with revolutionary spirit, it is anti-chauvinist. It *alone* stands among the masses of the people, and deeply rooted in their midst, as a protagonist of the internationalism of the toiling, the exploited, the oppressed. It *alone* has kept its ground in the general debacle. It *alone* leads semi-proletarian elements *away* from the social chauvinism of the Cadets, Trudoviks, Plekhanov, *Nasha Zarya*, and on to Socialism. Its existence, its ideas, its works, its appeal to the 'brotherhood of wage slaves of other countries' have been revealed to the whole of Russia by the trial of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Fraction.

"It is with this section that we must work. It is its unity that must be defended against social chauvinism. It is only along this road that the labour movement of Russia can develop towards social revolution and not towards national liberalism of the 'European' type."†

Events soon proved how completely correct Lenin was. Ilyich worked without interruption for the propaganda of the ideas of internationalism and the exposure of social-chauvinism in all its varied forms.

After mother's death I had a relapse of my ailment, and was ordered by the doctors to the mountains. Ilyich scanned the advertisements for a cheap boarding-house in a non-fashionable locality at the foot of the Rothorn in Soerenberg.

\* Muranov spoke at the trial on the illegal work of the fraction and the use of parliamentary methods for revolutionary purposes.

† Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 155-156. See also Badayev, *The Bolsheviks in the Tsarist Duma*.—Ed.

We decided on the Marienthal Hotel, and lived there the entire summer.

Shortly before our departure the "Japanese" (Bosche and Piatakov) came to Berne with a plan to publish an illegal magazine abroad, in which it would be possible to discuss thoroughly all the important problems. The *Communist* was to be published under the editorship of the Central Organ, augmented by P. and N. Nievsky (Bosche and Piatakov). This was agreed upon. In the course of the summer Ilyich wrote a long article for the *Communist*, entitled "The Collapse of the Second International,"\* During the same summer Ilyich, together with Zinoviev, prepared, in preparation for the conference of internationalists, a pamphlet entitled *Socialism and War*.†

We were quite comfortable at Soerenberg; all around there were woods, high mountains, and there was even snow on the peak of the Rothorn. Mail arrived with Swiss punctuality. We discovered that in such an out-of-the-way village as Soerenberg it was possible to obtain free of charge any book from the Berne or Zurich libraries. One sent a post card to the library with one's address and a request to send the book required. No questions asked, no certificates, no guarantees that one would not cheat the library out of the book—a complete contrast to bureaucratic France. Two days later the book arrives, wrapped in cardboard; a ticket is tied to the package, giving on one side the address of the person who requested the book and on the other side—the address of the library that sent the book. This arrangement enabled Ilyich to work in this out-of-the-way place. Ilyich had nothing but praise for Swiss culture. It was very comfortable to work at Soerenberg. Some time later Inessa came to stay with us. We would rise early, and before dinner, which was served at 12 o'clock everywhere in Switzerland, each of us would work in different nooks of the garden. During those hours Inessa often played the piano, and it was particularly good to work to the sounds of the music that reached us. After dinner we sometimes went to the moun-

\* *Selected Works*, Vol. V, pp. 167-265.

† *Little Lenin Library*. No. III

tains for the rest of the day. Ilyich loved the mountains—he liked to get to the crags of the Rothorn toward evening, when the view above was wonderful and below the fog was turning rosy; or to roam over the Schrattenfluh—there was such a mountain about two kilometres from us—we translated its name “cursed steps.” It was impossible to climb to the broad flat summit. The mountain was all covered with some kind of rock corroded by spring streams. We seldom climbed the Rothorn, although from there the view of the Alps was marvellous. We went to bed with the roosters, gathered alpine roses, berries; all of us were ardent mushroom-pickers, there was an abundance of white mushrooms, but there were also many other mushroom varieties, and we argued with so much heat about their classification that one might have thought it was a question of a resolution involving important principles.

In Germany the struggle began to flare up. In April the *International*, a magazine founded by Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring, was published and immediately suppressed. The pamphlet by Junius (Rosa Luxemburg) was published under the title *The Crisis of German Social-Democracy*. An appeal of the German Left Social-Democrats written by Karl Liebknecht, entitled *The Principal Enemy Is In Your Own Country*, was issued, and early in June, K. Liebknecht and Dunker drew up *An Open Letter to the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Party and the Reichstag Fraction*, protesting against the attitude of the Social-Democratic majority toward the war. This *Open Letter* was signed by a thousand functionaries of the Party.

Noticing the growing influence of the left Social-Democrats, the Central Committee of the German Social-Democratic Party decided to cut across this influence, and issued a manifesto signed by Kautsky, Haase and Bernstein against annexations, and calling for party unity. At the same time it issued another statement in its own name and in the name of the Reichstag fraction against the left opposition.

In Switzerland Robert Grimm called a preliminary conference for June 11th at Berne to discuss the preparations for the international conference of the Left-wingers. There were seven persons present at that conference (Grimm, Zinoviev, P. B.

Axelrod, Varsky, Valetsky, Balabanova, Morgari). Really, apart from Zinoviev, there were no real Left-wingers at that preliminary conference, and the impression one obtained from all the talk was that no one of the participants really wanted to call the conference.

Vladimir Ilyich was very excited and sedulously wrote letters in every direction—to Zinoviev, Radek, Berzin, Kolontai, the comrades at Lausanne, anxious that at the forthcoming Conference places should be secured for real Left-wingers and that there should be as much solid unity among the lefts as possible. Toward the middle of August the Bolsheviks already had drawn up: 1, a manifesto; 2, resolutions; 3, a draft of a declaration, which were sent to the most pronounced Left comrades for consideration and discussion. By October the pamphlet *Socialism and War*, by Lenin and Zinoviev, was already translated into German.

The Conference took place September 5th-8th at Zimmerwald.\* Delegates from eleven countries were present (38 delegates in all). The so-called Zimmerwald Left consisted of only nine (Lenin, Zinoviev, Berzin, Hoeglund, Nerman, Radek, Borchardt, Platten; after the conference, Rolland-Holst joined). Of the Russians there were also present at the Conference, Trotsky, Axelrod, Martov, Natanson, Chernov, and one Bundist. Trotsky did not join the Left Zimmerwaldists.

Vladimir Ilyich went to the Conference before it was due to open, and on September 4th, at a private conference, delivered a report concerning the nature of the war, and the tactics to be adopted by the International Conference. Debates centred around the question of a manifesto. The Lefts proposed their draft of a manifesto and resolution about the war and the tasks of the Social-Democrats. The majority rejected the draft of the Lefts and adopted a considerably more vague and less militant manifesto. Vladimir Ilyich gives an estimation of the Zimmerwald Conference in his article: "The First Step." The Lefts had signed the general manifesto that was adopted at the Conference, and in this article Ilyich asks: "Was our Central Committee right in

\* See *Selected Works*, Vol. V., pp. 227-231.

signing this manifesto, suffering as it does from lack of consistency, and from timidity?" And he answers: "We think so. That we disagree, that not only our Central Committee but that the whole international Left Wing section of the Conference adhering to the principles of revolutionary Marxism disagrees, is only expressed both in a special resolution, in a separate draft manifesto and in a separate declaration on the motives of voting for a compromise manifesto. We did not hide one iota of our views, slogans, tactics. The German edition of our pamphlet, *Socialism and War*, was distributed at the Conference. We had broadcasted, are broadcasting, and shall broadcast our views with no less energy than the manifesto. That this manifesto is taking a *step forward* towards a real struggle against opportunism, towards breaking and splitting with it, is a fact. It would be sectarianism to refuse to take this step together with the minority of the German, French, Swedish, Norwegian and Swiss Socialists when we retain full freedom and a full possibility to criticise inconsistency and a struggle for more.\*

At the Zimmerwald Conference the Lefts organised their own Bureau and in general formed a distinct group.

Although before the Zimmerwald Conference Ilyich had written that our draft resolution ought to be presented to the Kautskyites: "The Dutch plus ourselves, plus the Left Germans, plus nought—that does not matter; later it will be not nought but all," he wrote, nevertheless progress was very slow indeed, and Ilyich could not reconcile himself to this. The article, "The First Step," begins precisely with the emphasis on the slow development of the revolutionary movement. "The development of the international Socialist movement proceeds slowly in the epoch of the immense crisis created by the war." Ilyich, therefore, came back from the Zimmerwald Conference in a state of irritation.....

It required several days of roaming over the mountains and the atmosphere of Soerenberg before Ilyich was himself again. Kollontai was going to America, and Ilyich wrote urging her to do everything possible to consolidate the American left wing international elements. Early in October

\* See article, "The First Step," *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, p. 343.



we returned to Berne. Ilyich went to Geneva to deliver a lecture on the Zimmerwald Conference, continued to correspond with Kollontai about the Americans, etc.....

In the autumn of 1915 we sat in the libraries more diligently than ever, we took walks as usual, but all this could not remove the feeling of being copped up in this democratic cage. Somewhere beyond, a revolutionary struggle was mounting, life was astir, but it was all so far away.

At Berne little could be accomplished in the matter of establishing direct connections with the Lefts. I remember Inessa went to French Switzerland to establish contacts with the Swiss Lefts, Naine and Graber, but she could not manage to make an appointment with them. Either Naine was away fishing, or Graber was busy about the house. Father is busy to-day, it is our washing day, and he is hanging out the washing," Graber's little girl informed Inessa respectfully. Fishing and hanging out washing are not bad occupations; Ilyich more than once stood guard over a pot of milk to keep it from boiling over, but when laundry and the fishing line interfered with talking over important matters about organising the Lefts, it was not so good. Inessa obtained someone else's passport and went to Paris. Upon returning from Zimmerwald, Merrheim and Bourderon had founded a Committee in Paris for the re-establishment of international connections. Inessa went there to represent the Bolsheviks on the Committee. There she had to fight hard for the Left line which finally prevailed. She wrote to Vladimir Ilyich in detail about her work. She also did a great deal of work in our Paris group, met a member of the group, Sapozhkov, who had volunteered for the navy but now shared the views of the Bolsheviks and was beginning to conduct propaganda among the French soldiers.

Comrade Shklovsky organised a small chemical laboratory, and our people, Kasparov and Zinoviev, worked there to earn some money. Zinoviev gazed pensively at the tubes and bulbs that now appeared in everyone's room.

At Berne it was possible to do mainly theoretical work. During the year of war many things became clearer. In this connection the question of a United States of Europe is characteristic. In the declaration published by the Central

Committee in the Central Organ on November 1st, 1914, we read: "The immediate political slogan of the Social-Democrats of Europe must be the formation of a republican United States of Europe. But in contrast to the bourgeoisie which is ready to 'promise' anything in order to draw the proletariat into the general stream of chauvinism, the Social-Democrats will explain that this slogan is false and senseless without the revolutionary overthrow of the German, Austrian and Russian monarchies."\*

In March, during the conference of the sections abroad this slogan already gave rise to considerable controversy. In the report of the conference it is stated "on the question of the slogan of a 'United States of Europe,' the discussion took a one-sidedly political turn, and it was decided to postpone the question pending a discussion on the *economic* side of it in the press.†

The question of imperialism, its economic essence, the exploitation of the weaker states by the powerful imperialist states, the exploitation of the colonies, arose in all their magnitude. For this reason the Central Organ came to the conclusion that: "From the point of view of the economic conditions of imperialism, i.e. the export of capital and the division of the world between the 'progressive' and 'civilised' colonial powers, the United States of Europe is either impossible or reactionary under capitalism ..... A United States of Europe under capitalism is equivalent to an agreement to divide up the colonies."‡

But perhaps it was possible to advance another slogan, the slogan of a United States of the World? This is what Ilyich wrote in this connection: "The United States of the World (not of Europe alone) is a state form of national federation and national freedom which we connect with Socialism—until the complete victory of Communism brings about the total disappearance of the state, including the democratic state. As a separate slogan, however, the United States of the World would hardly be a correct one, because it may be wrongly interpreted to mean that the victory

\* Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. V., p. 129.

† *Ibid* p 131

‡ *Ibid*, pp. 139-140.

of Socialism in a single country is impossible; it may also create misconceptions as to the relations of such a country to the others."\* This article very well reveals the lines along which Ilyich was thinking in 1915. It is clear that he was considering a more profound study of the economic roots of the world war, i.e. of imperialism, on the one hand, and determining the roads which the world struggle for Socialism would take on the other.

It is on these questions that Ilyich worked at the end of 1915 and in 1916, gathering materials for his pamphlet *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, and re-reading Marx and Engels again and again in order to get a clearer picture of the epoch of the Socialist revolution, its paths and its development.

#### ZURICH (1916)

In January 1916 Vladimir Ilyich began writing his pamphlet on imperialism for the "Parus" publishing house. Ilyich attached tremendous importance to this question, and was of the opinion that it was impossible to give a real, profound appraisal of the war without making completely clear the essence of imperialism, both on its economic and political sides. He therefore willingly undertook this work. In the middle of February, Ilyich found some work to do in the libraries of Zurich, and we went there for a couple of weeks, and then we kept postponing our return until we finally remained in Zurich, which was livelier than Berno. In Zurich there was a considerable number of young foreigners imbued with revolutionary sentiments, there were a lot of workers there, the Social-Democratic Party there was inclined more to the Left and there seemed to be less of the petty bourgeois spirit about the place.

We went to rent a room. We came to a certain Frau Prelog, who looked more Viennese than Swiss, which was to be explained by the fact that she had worked for a long time as a cook in a hotel in Vienna. We settled in her house, but on the next day it appeared that her former tenant was coming back. Someone had cracked his head and he had been in the hospital, and now he was well again. Frau Prelog

\* *Ibid.*, p. 141.

asked us to find another room, but offered to provide meals for us at very reasonable rates. We ate there for about two months. She served us simple but ample food. Ilyich liked the simplicity of the service, the fact that coffee was served in a cup with a broken handle, that we ate in the kitchen, that the conversation was simple—not about the food, not about the quantity of potatoes to be used for a certain kind of soup, but about matters that were of interest to the boarders. There were not many of them, it is true, and they kept changing. We very soon realised that we had hit upon a peculiar environment, the very “lower depths” of Zurich. For some time a prostitute used to dine at this place, who spoke quite openly about her profession, but what concerned her most was not her profession, but the health of her mother and the kind of work her sister might find. For several days a night-nurse boarded there, then other boarders began to appear. Frau Prelog had a lodger who did not talk much, but from the casual phrases he uttered it was clear that he was of an almost criminal type. No one was embarrassed by our company, and it must be said that in the conversations of those people there was more of the “human,” the living element, than that heard in the prim dining-rooms of a respectable hotel patronised by well-to-do guests.

I urged Ilyich to change to private board because I feared that with this crowd we might get mixed up in some unpleasant affair. Yet, some of the traits of Zurich’s “lower depths” were not without interest.

Later, I read John Reed’s *Daughter of the Revolution* and what I liked particularly was the fact that Reed pictured the prostitutes, not from the standpoint of their profession or of love, but from the standpoint of their other interests. Usually, when the “underworld” is portrayed, little attention is paid to social conditions.

Once when we were in Russia Ilyich and I went to see Gorky’s *Lower Depths* at the Art Theatre—Ilyich wanted very much to see the play—but he greatly disliked the “theatricality” of the production, the absence of those details of social life which, as the saying goes, “make the music,” portray the environment in all its concreteness.

Afterwards, every time Ilyich met Frau Prelog in the street

he always greeted her in a friendly manner. And we were always meeting her, for we moved to a place nearby, in a narrow alley, staying with the family of a shoemaker named Kammerer. Our room did not quite suit our purpose. The house was an old and sombre one, of construction dating back almost to the sixteenth century, the court was smelly. For the same rent we could have found a better room, but we greatly valued our hosts. It was a worker's family, their outlook was a revolutionary one and they condemned the imperialist war. The place was truly an "international" one: two rooms were occupied by the "landlord," one by the wife of a German soldier-baker and her children, another by an Italian, a third by Austrian actors who had a wonderful brown cat, and the fourth—by us Russians. There was no chauvinism in the air, and once when a whole women's international gathered around the gas-stove Frau Kammerer exclaimed indignantly: "The soldiers ought to turn their weapons against their governments!" After that Ilyich would not listen to any suggestions about changing quarters.

From Frau Kammerer I learned a good deal: how to cook satisfying dinners and suppers with the least expenditure of time and money. I also learned something else. Once it was announced in the papers that Switzerland was experiencing difficulties in importing meat and that the government therefore appealed to the citizens to abstain from meat twice a week. The butcher-shops continued selling meat on "meatless" days. I bought meat for dinner as usual, and as I stood by the gas-stove I asked Frau Kammerer what check-up there was to see if the citizens complied with the appeal not to use meat. Were there inspectors going the rounds of the houses?

"But why a check-up?" Frau Kammerer wondered—"once it was published in the papers that there are difficulties, what working man will eat meat on meatless days? Only a bourgeois would do that!" And noticing my embarrassment she added gently: "This does not apply to foreigners." Ilyich was quite captivated by this intelligent proletarian approach. . . .

In Zurich we lived "quietly," as Ilyich put it in one of his

letters, somewhat removed from the local colony; we worked regularly and a good deal in the libraries. After dinner every day the young Comrade Grisha Usievich—he fell in the civil war in 1919—would come up for a half hour on his way from the emigrant's dining-room. For a time we had morning visits from a nephew of Zemlyatchka, who later became insane as a result of starvation. He was so tattered and spattered with mud that they refused to admit him to the Swiss libraries. He tried to see Ilyich before the latter left for the library, saying that he had to discuss certain matters of principle with him. . . .

We began leaving the house earlier in order to take a walk by the lake and have a chat before library time. Ilyich spoke of the book he was writing and of his various ideas.

Those of the Zurich group we met most frequently were Usievich and Kharitonov. I also remember "Uncle Vanya"—Avdeyev, a metal worker, Turkin, a worker from the Urals, and Boytsov, who later worked in the Central Bureau of Political Education (*Glavpolitprosviet*). I recall, too, a Bulgarian worker, whose name I have forgotten. Most of the comrades of our Zurich group worked in factories; they were all very busy and group meetings were comparatively rare. To make up for this, the members of the group had good connections with the workers of Zurich; they were closer to the life of the local workers than our groups in other Swiss cities (with the exception of Chaux-de-Fonds, where our group was even closer to the mass of workers).

At the head of the Swiss movement in Zurich was Fritz Platten; he was the secretary of the Party. He was an adherent of the Zimmerwald Left Group, was the son of a worker—a simple, ardent fellow who had much influence upon the masses. The editor of *Volksrecht*, Nobbs, also joined the Zimmerwald Lefts. The young emigrant workers—there were many of them in Zurich—with Willi Muenzenberg at the head, were very active, supporting the Lefts. All this brought us rather close to the Swiss labour movement. Some comrades who had never lived among the emigres now think that Ilyich had particular hopes of the Swiss movement and thought that Switzerland might become almost the centre of the coming social revolution.

This, of course, is not so. There was no strong working class in Switzerland; it is mainly a country of health resorts, a small country feeding on the crumbs of the strong capitalist countries. The workers of Switzerland are, on the whole, not very revolutionary. Democracy, and the successful solution of the national question were not sufficient to make Switzerland the hotbed of the social revolution.

This did not mean, of course, that it was not necessary to conduct international propaganda in Switzerland and to help revolutionise the Swiss labour movement and the Party, for if Switzerland were drawn into the war, the situation might have changed quickly.

Ilyich delivered lectures to audiences of Swiss workers, maintained close contact with Platten, Nobbs and Muenzenberg. Our Zurich group and a few Polish comrades (Comrade Bronsky was at that time living in Zurich) undertook to arrange joint meetings with the Swiss organisations in Zurich. They began gathering in a small cafe, "Zum Adler," not far from our house. The first meeting was attended by about forty persons. Ilyich spoke on current events and posed the problems very sharply. Though the gathering consisted of internationalists, the Swiss were quite embarrassed by the sharpness with which Ilyich made his points. I remember the speech of a representative of the Swiss youth to the effect that one cannot break through a stone wall with one's forehead. The fact remains that our meetings began to melt away, and to the fourth meeting only the Russians and the Poles came, and after exchanging some banter they went home.

During the first months of our stay in Zurich, Vladimir Ilyich worked mainly on his pamphlet on imperialism. He was very much absorbed in this work and copied numerous excerpts from the works he read. He was particularly interested in colonies; he had gathered a wealth of material and I remember how he put me to work translating from the English something about some African colonies. He used to tell many interesting things. Later, when I re-read his *Imperialism* it seemed to me much drier than his stories had been. He studied the economic life of Europe, America, etc., as the saying goes, to a "t." But of course, he was not only

interested in the economic system, but also in the political forms that correspond to that system and their influence on the masses. By June the pamphlet was completed.

The second Zimmerwald Conference (the so-called Kienthal Conference) took place April 24th-30th, 1916.\* Eight months had elapsed since the first conference, eight months of ever-broadening imperialist war, yet the face of the Kienthal Conference was not so strikingly different from the first Zimmerwald Conference. The Zimmerwald Left group had twelve instead of eight delegates, the resolutions of the conference marked a step forward. The conference defiantly condemned the International Socialist Bureau, adopting a resolution on peace which stated: "It is impossible to establish firm peace on the foundation of capitalist society; the conditions necessary for its realisation will be created by *Socialism*. By abolishing capitalist private property and thereby abolishing the exploitation of the masses of the people by the propertied classes and national oppression, Socialism will also abolish the causes of war. For this reason, the struggle for a durable peace can only take the form of a struggle for the realisation of Socialism." Three German officers and thirty-two privates were executed in May for distributing this manifesto in the trenches. The German Government feared the revolutionisation of the masses more than anything else. In its proposals to the Kienthal Conference the Central Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party called attention precisely to the necessity of revolutionising the masses. The proposal stated:

'It is not sufficient for the Zimmerwald Manifesto to hint at revolution by saying that the workers must make sacrifices for their own and not for somebody else's cause. It is necessary clearly and definitely to indicate to the masses the road they must take. The masses must know where they are to go and why they should go there. It is obvious that mass revolutionary action during the war, if successfully developed, can lead only to the imperialist war becoming transformed into civil war for socialism, and it is harmful to conceal this from the masses. On the contrary, this aim must be indicated clearly, no matter how difficult its attainment

\* See *History of the C.P.S.U. (B.)* p. 166.



may appear now, when we are still at the beginning of the road. It is not sufficient to say, as the Zimmerwald Manifesto does, that 'the capitalists lie when they speak about the defence of the Fatherland' in the present war, and that the workers in their revolutionary struggle must not take into account the military situation of their country; it is necessary to say clearly the thing that is here merely hinted at, namely, that it is not only the capitalists, but also the social-chauvinists and the Kautskyists who lie when they allow the term, 'defence of the Fatherland,' to be applied to the present imperialist war: that revolutionary action during the war is impossible without creating the danger of defeat for 'one's own' government; and that defeat of the government in a reactionary war facilitates revolution, which alone is capable of bringing about a lasting and democratic peace. Finally, it is necessary to tell the masses that unless they themselves create underground organisations and a press that is free from military censorship, i.e. an underground press, it will be utterly impossible to render serious support to the incipient revolutionary struggle, to develop it, to criticise each step it takes, to correct its errors, and systematically broaden and sharpen it."\*

In this proposal of the Central Committee we find a clear expression of the attitude of the Bolsheviks and Ilyich to the masses; the masses must always be told the whole truth, the unvarnished truth, without fearing that the truth will frighten them away. The Bolsheviks placed all their hopes in the masses—the masses and only the masses will attain Socialism.

In a letter to Shlyapnikov dated June 1st, I wrote: "Gregory is very enthusiastic about Kienthal. Of course, I can judge only by reports, but there seems to have been too much rhetoric and no inner unity, the kind of unity that would be a guarantee of the solidity of the thing. It seems that the masses are not yet 'pushing' as Badaich expressed it, except perhaps, to some extent, the Germans."

The study of the economics of imperialism, the analysis of the component parts of this "gear-box," the grasp of the entire world-picture of imperialism—this last stage of capitalism—heading for ruin—all this enabled Ilyich to present

\* Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. V., p. 238.

a number of political problems in a new way and to approach more profoundly the question as to the forms which the struggle for Socialism in general, and in Russia in particular, would assume.

Ilyich wanted very much to think his ideas out to the end, to give them time to mature: so we decided to go to the mountains; and, moreover, it was necessary for us to go, for I could not shake off my illness. There was only one way of securing relief—the mountains. We went for six weeks to the Canton of St. Galen, not far from Zurich, to the Chudivise rest-home amidst wild mountains, very high up and not far from the snow-peaks...

No one came to visit us, there were no Russians living in the place and we were detached from all affairs, roaming the mountains for days on end. In Chudivise Ilyich did not work at all. During our walks in the mountains he spoke a good deal about the questions that occupied his mind at that time, about the role of democracy, about the positive and negative sides of Swiss democracy, always expressing the same thought in different words. . . .

We lived in the mountains during the latter half of July and the month of August. We left for Zurich at the beginning of September. . . . As we were descending through a wood, Vladimir Ilyich suddenly noticed white mushrooms, and in spite of the fact that it was raining he began eagerly picking them, as if they had been so many Zimmerwald Lefts. We were drenched to the bone, but picked a sackful of mushrooms. Of course we missed the train and had to wait two hours at the station for the next one.

Upon arrival in Zurich we again took a room with the same people on Spiegelstrasse.

During our stay at Chudivise Vladimir Ilyich thought out from every angle his plan of work for the immediate future. The first thing of importance, particularly at that moment, was agreement on matters of theory, the establishment of a clear theoretical line. He had differences of opinion with Rosa Luxemburg, Radek, the Dutch, Bukharin, Piatakov and a little also with Kollontai. His sharpest differences were with Piatakov (P. Kievsky) who in August had written an article entitled "The Proletariat and the Right of Nations

to Self-Determination." After reading the manuscript Vladimir Ilyich immediately sat down to write him an answer—a whole pamphlet, *A Caricature of Marxism and "Imperialist Economism."*\* The pamphlet was written in a very angry tone, and precisely for the reason that at that time Ilyich had already worked out a very clear, definite view of the relationship between economics and politics in the epoch of struggle for Socialism. The under-estimation of the political struggle in that epoch he characterised as imperialist economism. In this pamphlet Ilyich wrote: "Capitalism is victorious, *therefore* it is not necessary to think about political questions, this was the argument used by the old 'economists' in 1894-1901, who went so far as to repudiate the political struggle in Russia. Imperialism is victorious *therefore* it is not necessary to think about questions of political democracy, is the argument of the modern 'imperialist economist.'"

The role of democracy in the struggle for Socialism cannot be ignored. "Socialism is impossible without democracy in two respects,"—Vladimir Ilyich wrote in the same pamphlet—1. "the proletariat cannot accomplish the Socialist revolution if it is not prepared for it through the struggle for democracy; 2. victorious Socialism cannot maintain its victory and bring humanity to the time when the state will die out without the complete realisation of democracy."

These words were soon fully justified by events in Russia. The February revolution and the subsequent struggle for democracy prepared the way for the revolution of October. The constant broadening and strengthening of the Soviets, of the Soviet system, reorganises democracy itself, constantly deepening the content of this concept.

In 1915-1916 Vladimir Ilyich had already thoroughly thought out the question of democracy, approaching the question from the standpoint of building Socialism. As early as November 1915, in replying to an article by Radok ("Parabellum") printed in the *Berner Tagewacht* in October 1915, Ilyich wrote:

"As to Comrade Parabellum, he, in the name of a Socialist revolution, scornfully rejects a consistently revolutionary pro-

\* Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. V., p. 290. (Extracts).

gramme in the realm of democracy. This is incorrect. The proletariat cannot become victor save through democracy, i.e. through introducing complete democracy and through combining with every step of its movement democratic demands formulated most vigorously, most decisively. It is senseless to *contrast* the Socialist revolution and the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with *one* of the questions of democracy, in this case the national question. On the contrary, we must combine the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with a revolutionary programme and revolutionary tactics relative to *all* democratic demands: a republic, a militia, officials elected by the people, equal rights for women, self-determination of nations, etc. While capitalism exists, all these demands are realisable only as an exception, and in incomplete, distorted form. Basing ourselves on democracy as it already exists, exposing its incompleteness under capitalism, we advocate the overthrow of capitalism, expropriation of the bourgeoisie as a necessary basis both for the abolition of the poverty of the masses and for a complete and manifold realisation of all democratic reforms. Some of those reforms will be started prior to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, others in the process of the overthrow, still others after it has been accomplished. The Socialist revolution is by no means a single battle; on the contrary, it is an epoch of a whole series of battles around *all* problems of economic and democratic reforms, which can be completed only by the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. It is for the sake of this final aim that we must formulate *every one* of our democratic demands in a consistently revolutionary manner. It is quite conceivable that the workers of a certain country may overthrow the bourgeoisie *before* even one fundamental democratic reform has been accomplished in full. It is entirely inconceivable, however, that the proletariat as an historical class will be able to defeat the bourgeoisie if it is not prepared for this task by being educated in the spirit of the most consistent and determinedly revolutionary democracy."<sup>2</sup>

I quote such long passages because they very clearly express the ideas which left an imprint on his later utterances. Most of his articles dealing with the questions of the role of

\* Lenin: *Collected Works*, XVIII, p. 368, *Selected Works*, V., p. 283.

to Self-Determination." After reading the manuscript Vladimir Ilyich immediately sat down to write him an answer—a whole pamphlet, *A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism*.\* The pamphlet was written in a very angry tone, and precisely for the reason that at that time Ilyich had already worked out a very clear, definite view of the relationship between economics and politics in the epoch of struggle for Socialism. The under-estimation of the political struggle in that epoch he characterised as imperialist economism. In this pamphlet Ilyich wrote: "Capitalism is victorious, *therefore* it is not necessary to think about political questions, this was the argument used by the old 'economists' in 1894-1901, who went so far as to repudiate the political struggle in Russia. Imperialism is victorious *therefore* it is not necessary to think about questions of political democracy, is the argument of the modern 'imperialist economist.'"

The role of democracy in the struggle for Socialism cannot be ignored. "Socialism is impossible without democracy in two respects,"—Vladimir Ilyich wrote in the same pamphlet—1. "the proletariat cannot accomplish the Socialist revolution if it is not prepared for it through the struggle for democracy; 2. victorious Socialism cannot maintain its victory and bring humanity to the time when the state will die out without the complete realisation of democracy."

These words were soon fully justified by events in Russia. The February revolution and the subsequent struggle for democracy prepared the way for the revolution of October. The constant broadening and strengthening of the Soviets, of the Soviet system, reorganises democracy itself, constantly deepening the content of this concept.

In 1915-1916 Vladimir Ilyich had already thoroughly thought out the question of democracy, approaching the question from the standpoint of building Socialism. As early as November 1915, in replying to an article by Radek ("Parabellum") printed in the *Berner Tagewacht* in October 1915, Ilyich wrote:

"As to Comrade Parabellum, he, in the name of a Socialist revolution, scornfully rejects a consistently revolutionary pro-

\* Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. V., p. 290. (Extracts).

gramme in the realm of democracy. This is incorrect. The proletariat cannot become victor save through democracy, i.e. through introducing complete democracy and through combining with every step of its movement democratic demands formulated most vigorously, most decisively. It is senseless to *contrast* the Socialist revolution and the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with *one* of the questions of democracy, in this case the national question. On the contrary, we must combine the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with a revolutionary programme and revolutionary tactics relative to *all* democratic demands: a republic, a militia, officials elected by the people, equal rights for women, self-determination of nations, etc. While capitalism exists, all these demands are realisable only as an exception, and in incomplete, distorted form. Basing ourselves on democracy as it already exists, exposing its incompleteness under capitalism, we advocate the overthrow of capitalism, expropriation of the bourgeoisie as a necessary basis both for the abolition of the poverty of the masses and for a complete and manifold realisation of all democratic reforms. Some of those reforms will be started prior to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, others in the process of the overthrow, still others after it has been accomplished. The Socialist revolution is by no means a single battle; on the contrary, it is an epoch of a whole series of battles around *all* problems of economic and democratic reforms, which can be completed only by the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. It is for the sake of this final aim that we must formulate *every one* of our democratic demands in a consistently revolutionary manner. It is quite conceivable that the workers of a certain country may overthrow the bourgeoisie *before* even one fundamental democratic reform has been accomplished in full. It is entirely inconceivable, however, that the proletariat as an historical class will be able to defeat the bourgeoisie if it is not prepared for this task by being educated in the spirit of the most consistent and determinedly revolutionary democracy."<sup>\*</sup>

I quote such long passages because they very clearly express the ideas which left an imprint on his later utterances. Most of his articles dealing with the questions of the role of

<sup>\*</sup> Lenin: *Collected Works*, XVIII, p. 368, *Selected Works*, V., p. 283.

democracy in the struggle for Socialism were published much later; the article against "Parabellum"—in 1927, the pamphlet, *A Caricature of Marxism*, in 1924. They are little known because they were published in magazines with not very large circulations; yet without having read these articles one cannot understand the heat shown by Vladimir Ilyich in his arguments on the right of nations to self-determination. This heat becomes understandable when the matter is considered in connection with Ilyich's general estimation of democracy. It must be borne in mind that Ilyich regarded the attitude one took toward the question of self-determination as a test of one's ability to approach correctly democratic demands in general. All the disputes along this line with Rosa Luxemburg, with Radek, the Dutch and Kievsky, as well as with other comrades, were conducted from just this point of view. In the pamphlet against Kievsky he wrote: "All nations will come to Socialism, this is inevitable, but they will not all reach it in the same way; every nation will introduce certain special features into this or that form of democracy, this or that variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, this or that tempo of the Socialist transformations of the various sides of social life. There is nothing that is theoretically more paltry and practically more ridiculous than to picture, 'in the name of historical materialism,' a future painted, in this respect, in the same drab colour; this would be a mere Suzdal daub."

The building of Socialism is not only economic building. Economics is only the base of Socialist construction, its foundation, its premise; the crux of Socialist construction lies in the rebuilding of the entire social fabric, a rebuilding on the basis of Socialist revolutionary democracy.

This, perhaps, is what most divided Lenin and Trotsky. Trotsky did not understand the democratic spirit, the democratic principles of Socialist construction, the process of reorganising the entire mode of life of the masses. Also at that time, in 1916, the later differences between Ilyich and Bukharin already existed in embryo. At the end of August Bukharin wrote an article in the *Jugend-Internationale* No. 6, signed "Nota-Bene," which showed that he underestimated the role of the state, underestimated the role of the

dictatorship of the proletariat. In a note in the *Jugend-Internationale* Ilyich pointed out this error of Bukharin's.\* The dictatorship of the proletariat, which ensures the leading role of the proletariat in the reconstruction of the entire social fabric—this is what particularly interested Vladimir Ilyich in the latter half of 1916.

Democratic demands are included in the minimum programme—and in the first letter he wrote to Shlyapnikov after returning from Chudovise, Ilyich scolds Bazarov for an article in *Letopisi* in which the latter advocated the abolition of the minimum programme. He argued with Bukharin who underestimated the role of the state, the role of the dictatorship of the proletariat, etc. He was indignant with Kievsky because the latter did not understand the leading role of the proletariat. "Don't look with disdain upon the harmony of theoretical opinion; honestly, it is needed in work during these difficult times."

Vladimir Ilyich began diligently re-reading all that had been written by Marx and Engels on the state, and took extracts from their works. This equipped him with a particularly profound understanding of the nature of the coming revolution, and prepared him most thoroughly for the understanding of the concrete tasks of that revolution.

On November 30th a conference of the Swiss Lefts took place on the attitude toward the war. A. Schmidt from Winterthur spoke of the necessity of taking advantage of the democratic system in Switzerland for anti-militarist purposes. Next day Lenin wrote a letter to A. Schmidt suggesting that a referendum be taken on the question, formulated in the following manner: *for* the expropriation of the large capitalist enterprises in industry and agriculture as the *only way* towards the complete abolition of militarism, or *against* expropriation.

"In this case we will in our practical politics say the same thing,"—Ilyich wrote to Schmidt, "that in theory we recognise that the complete abolition of militarism is conceivable only in conjunction with the abolition of capitalism." In a letter written in December 1916 and only published fifteen years later, Lenin wrote on this question:

\*Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. V., p. 243.



"Perhaps you think that I am so naive as to believe that it is possible to solve such questions as the question about the Socialist revolution 'by means of persuasion?' No; I only wish to give an *illustration*, and then only of one *part of the question*, viz., what *change* must take place in the entire propaganda of the Party if we want to take up a really serious attitude on the question of *rejecting the defence of the fatherland*! This is *only* an illustration to *only* a part of the question—I do not claim any more." Question of a dialectical approach to the events of that period also occupied Ilyich. He simply clutched at the following sentence in Engels' criticism of the draft of the "Erfurt programme": "Such a policy can in the end only lead the Party on to the wrong road. General, abstract political questions are put in the foreground and thus obscure immediate concrete questions which will automatically come up on the order of the day at the very first outbreak of big events, in the first political crisis." Having copied this passage Ilyich wrote in very large letters, putting the words in double parentheses: "((The abstract in the foreground, the concrete obscured ! !)) Nota Bene ! Excellent! That's the main thing ! N.B.\*

"Marxian dialectics demands a concrete analysis of every particular historical situation," wrote Vladimir Ilyich in his review of the pamphlet by Junius.† He particularly strove during that period to consider all things in all their connections and inter-relations. From this standpoint he approached both the question of democracy and of the right of nations to self-determination.

In the autumn of 1916 and at the beginning of 1917 Ilyich steeped himself in theoretical work. He tried to utilise all the time the library was open. He got there exactly at 9 o'clock, stayed until 12, came home exactly at 10 minutes past 12 (the library was closed from 12 to 1), after lunch he returned to the library and stayed there until 6 o'clock. It was not very convenient to work at home. Although we had a light room, the windows faced a yard from which

\* See *State and Revolution*, Selected Works, VII., p. 65; Little Lenin Library, 14, p. 54; *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, p. 69.

† English translation, *Labour Monthly*, Jan-Feb., 1935.

came an intolerable stench, for a sausage factory adjoined the yard. We opened the window only late at night. On Thursdays, after lunch, when the library was closed, we went to Zurichberg mountain. On his way from the library Ilyich usually bought two bars of nut chocolate, in blue wrappers, at 15 centimes a piece, and after lunch we took the chocolate and some books and went to the mountain. We had a favourite spot there in the very thick of the woods, where there was no crowd. Ilyich would lie there on the grass and read diligently.

At that time we instituted a doubly rigid economy in our personal life. Ilyich searched everywhere for some way of earning money—he wrote about it to Granat, to Gorki, to relatives and once even developed a fantastic plan to publish a “pedagogical encyclopedia,” on which I was to work. At that time I did considerable work studying pedagogical questions and familiarising myself with the practical side of the schools in Zurich. Ilyich got so enthusiastic about this fantastic plan that he wrote something to the effect that care must be taken lest someone steal this idea.

The prospect of earning something by writing was rather poor, and I therefore decided to look for work in Zurich. In Zurich there was the Bureau of the Political Emigrant Relief organisations, at the head of which was Felix Yakovlevich Kon. I became the secretary of the Bureau and helped Felix Yakovlevich in his work.

It is true that the income from this was semi-mythical, but the work had to be done. Assistance had to be given to comrades to find work, to organise various undertakings and to arrange for medical assistance. Funds were very low at that time and there were more projects than real assistance. I remember a plan was proposed to establish a sanatorium on a self-paying basis; the Swiss have such sanatoria. The patients work several hours a day at gardening or making cane chairs in the open air and this helps to reduce the cost of their maintenance. The percentage of consumptives among the political emigrants was very large.

So we lived in Zurich, unhurriedly and quietly, while the situation became much more revolutionary. Along with his work in the realm of theory Ilyich considered it of the great-

est importance to work out a correct tactical line. He thought that the time was ripe for a split on an international scale, that it was necessary to break with the Second International, with the International Socialist Bureau, to break forever with Kautsky and Co., to begin with the forces of the Zimmerwald Lefts to build a Third International. In Russia it was necessary at once to break with Tcheidze, Skovelev and the followers of the Organisation Committee,\* and those who, like Trotsky, did not understand that this was no time for reconciliation and talk about unity. It was necessary to conduct a revolutionary struggle for Socialism and to expose ruthlessly the opportunists whose words did not match their deeds, who in reality were serving the bourgeoisie and betraying the cause of the proletariat. Never, I think, was Vladimir Ilyich in a more irreconcilable mood than during the last months of 1916 and the early months of 1917. He was profoundly convinced that the revolution was approaching.

\* The leading body of the Mensheviks. *Ed.*

## VI

1917

### BEFORE THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

On January 22nd, 1917, Vladimir Ilyich delivered a lecture on the 1905 Revolution at a youth meeting organised in the Zurich Peoples' House. At that time there were many young people of revolutionary tendency in Zurich from other countries—Germany, Italy, etc., who did not want to participate in the imperialist war. Vladimir Ilyich wanted to convey to those young people as fully as possible the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the workers, to show them the significance of the Moscow uprising. He considered the 1905 Revolution to be a prologue to the coming European revolution. "Undoubtedly," he said, "this coming revolution can only be a proletarian revolution in the profounder sense of this word: a proletarian, Socialist revolution even in its content. This coming revolution will show to an even greater degree on the one hand that only stern battles, only civil wars, can free humanity from the yolk of capital; on the other hand that only class-conscious proletarians can and will come forth in the role of leaders of the vast majority of the exploited." Ilyich did not for one minute doubt that such were the prospects. But naturally, he could not know how soon this coming revolution would take place. "We of the older generation may not live to see the decisive battles of this coming revolution," he said sadly, in concluding his lecture.\*

And yet Ilyich thought of and worked only for this coming revolution. But one day, after dinner, when Ilyich was getting ready to leave for the library, and I had finished with the dishes, Bronsky ran in with the announcement, "Haven't you heard the news? There is a revolution in Russia!"—and told us what was written in the special editions of the newspapers that were issued. When Bronsky left, we went

\* *The Revolution of 1905.* Little Lenin Library, No. 6.

to the lake, where on the shore all the newspapers were hung up as soon as they came out.

We read the telegrams over several times. There really was a revolution in Russia. Ilyich's mind worked intensely. I do not remember how the rest of the day and the evening passed. Next day the second series of government telegrams dealing with the February revolution were received and Ilyich was already writing to Kollontai in Stockholm. "*Never again* along the lines of the Second International! *Never again* with Kautsky! By all means a *more revolutionary* programme and more revolutionary tactics." And further, "revolutionary propaganda, as heretofore, agitation and struggle for an *international* proletarian revolution and for the seizure of power by the 'Soviets of Workers' Deputies' (but not by the Cadet fakirs')."<sup>\*</sup>

Ilyich immediately took a clear, uncompromising line, but he had not yet grasped the scope of the revolution. Measuring it by that of the 1905 Revolution, he said that the most important task at that moment was to combine legal and illegal work.

Next day, in answer to Kollontai's telegram asking for instructions, he wrote differently, more concretely. He did not write of the seizure of power by the Soviets of Workers' Deputies as a perspective, but urged that concrete measures be taken to prepare for the seizure of power, for arming the masses, for the fight for bread, peace and freedom. "Spread out!! Rouse new sections! Awaken fresh initiative, form new organisations in every layer and *prove* to them that *peace* can come only with the armed Soviet of Workers' Deputies in power."<sup>†</sup> Together with Zinoviev, Ilyich began to work at theses on the February revolution.

From the moment news of the February revolution came, Ilyich burned with eagerness to go to Russia.

England and France would not for the world have allowed the Bolsheviks to pass through to Russia. This was clear to Ilyich—"we fear," he wrote to Kollontai—"we will not succeed in leaving this cursed Switzerland for some time." And taking this into consideration, he, in his letters of March

<sup>\*</sup> Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XX, Book I, p. 20.

<sup>†</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

16th and 17th, made arrangements with Kollontai how best to re-establish contacts with Petrograd.

As there was no legal way it was necessary to travel illegally. But how? From the moment the news of the revolution came, Ilyich did not sleep, and at night all sorts of incredible plans were made. We could travel by airplane. But such things could be thought of only in the semi-delirium of the night. One had only to formulate it vocally to realise the utter impracticability of such a plan. A passport of a foreigner from a neutral country would have had to be obtained, a Swedish passport would be best as a Swede arouses less suspicion. A Swedish passport could have been obtained through the aid of the Swedish comrades, but there was the further obstacle of our not knowing the Swedish language. Perhaps only a little Swedish would do. But it would be easy to give one's self away. "You will fall asleep and see Mensheviks in your dreams and you will start swearing, and shout, scoundrels, scoundrels! and give the whole conspiracy away," I said to him teasingly.

Still, Ilyich inquired of Ganetsky as to whether there was some way in which he could be smuggled through Germany.

On March 18th, the anniversary of the Paris Commune, Ilyich went to Chaux-de-Fonds, a large Swiss workers' centre. Ilyich was very glad to go. A young comrade named Abramovich who worked at a factory, and was active in the Swiss labour movement, lived there. Ilyich had been thinking about the Paris Commune, of how to make use of its experience in the nascent Russian revolutionary movement, and of how to avoid its errors, and so his lecture went off very well, and he was pleased with it himself. The lecture produced a profound impression on our comrades, but the Swiss thought it somewhat visionary—even the centres of the Swiss working-class movement understood very dimly the events that were taking place in Russia.

On March 19th there was a meeting of the Russian political emigre groups in Switzerland which adhered to the international position, to discuss ways and means of getting back to Russia. Martov presented a plan to obtain permits for emigrants to pass through Germany in exchange for

to the lake, where on the shore all the newspapers were hung up as soon as they came out.

We read the telegrams over several times. There really was a revolution in Russia. Ilyich's mind worked intensely. I do not remember how the rest of the day and the evening passed. Next day the second series of government telegrams dealing with the February revolution were received and Ilyich was already writing to Kollontai in Stockholm. "*Never again* along the lines of the Second International! *Never again* with Kantsky! By all means a *more revolutionary* programme and more revolutionary tactics." And further, "revolutionary propaganda, as heretofore, agitation and struggle for an *international* proletarian revolution and for the seizure of power by the 'Soviets of Workers' Deputies' (but not by the Cadet fakirs')."<sup>\*</sup>

Ilyich immediately took a clear, uncompromising line, but he had not yet grasped the scope of the revolution. Measuring it by that of the 1905 Revolution, he said that the most important task at that moment was to combine legal and illegal work.

Next day, in answer to Kollontai's telegram asking for instructions, he wrote differently, more concretely. He did not write of the seizure of power by the Soviets of Workers' Deputies as a perspective, but urged that concrete measures be taken to prepare for the seizure of power, for arming the masses, for the fight for bread, peace and freedom. "Spread out!! Rouse new sections! Awaken fresh initiative, form new organisations in every layer and *prove* to them that *peace* can come only with the armed Soviet of Workers' Deputies in power."<sup>†</sup> Together with Zinoviev, Ilyich began to work at theses on the February revolution.

From the moment news of the February revolution came, Ilyich burned with eagerness to go to Russia.

England and France would not for the world have allowed the Bolsheviks to pass through to Russia. This was clear to Ilyich—"we fear," he wrote to Kollontai—"we will not succeed in leaving this cursed Switzerland for some time." And taking this into consideration, he, in his letters of March

<sup>\*</sup> Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XX, Book I, p. 20.

<sup>†</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

16th and 17th, made arrangements with Kollontai how best to re-establish contacts with Petrograd.

As there was no legal way it was necessary to travel illegally. But how? From the moment the news of the revolution came, Ilyich did not sleep, and at night all sorts of incredible plans were made. We could travel by airplane. But such things could be thought of only in the semi-delirium of the night. One had only to formulate it vocally to realise the utter impracticability of such a plan. A passport of a foreigner from a neutral country would have had to be obtained, a Swedish passport would be best as a Swede arouses less suspicion. A Swedish passport could have been obtained through the aid of the Swedish comrades, but there was the further obstacle of our not knowing the Swedish language. Perhaps only a little Swedish would do. But it would be easy to give one's self away. "You will fall asleep and see Mensheviks in your dreams and you will start swearing, and shout, scoundrels, scoundrels! and give the whole conspiracy away," I said to him teasingly.

Still, Ilyich inquired of Ganetsky as to whether there was some way in which he could be smuggled through Germany.

On March 18th, the anniversary of the Paris Commune, Ilyich went to Chaux-de-Fonds, a large Swiss workers' centre. Ilyich was very glad to go. A young comrade named Abramovich who worked at a factory, and was active in the Swiss labour movement, lived there. Ilyich had been thinking about the Paris Commune, of how to make use of its experience in the nascent Russian revolutionary movement, and of how to avoid its errors, and so his lecture went off very well, and he was pleased with it himself. The lecture produced a profound impression on our comrades, but the Swiss thought it somewhat visionary—even the centres of the Swiss working-class movement understood very dimly the events that were taking place in Russia.

On March 19th there was a meeting of the Russian political emigre groups in Switzerland which adhered to the international position, to discuss ways and means of getting back to Russia. Martov presented a plan to obtain permits for emigrants to pass through Germany in exchange for



German and Austrian prisoners of war interned in Russia. But no one wanted to go that way, except Lenin, who snatched at this plan. The plan had to be carried out carefully, and it was thought that it would be best for the Swiss government to take the initiative in raising the matter. Grimm was commissioned to open negotiations with the Swiss government, but nothing came of it; the telegrams that were sent to Russia were not answered. Ilyich was in great distress. "What a torment it is for all of us to sit here at such a time," he wrote to Ganotsky in Stockholm. But he already had complete control of himself.

On March 18th, *Pravda* began to be issued in Petrograd and on the 20th Ilyich started sending his "Letters from Afar" to the paper. There were five letters (*The First Stage of the First Revolution, The New Government and the Proletariat, On Proletarian Militia, How to Secure Peace, Problems of Revolutionary Proletarian Organisation of the State*)\*. Only the first letter had been published when Lenin finally arrived in Petrograd, three were lying in the editor's office and the fifth had not been sent to *Pravda*, as Lenin had only started writing it on the eve of his departure to Russia.

These letters reflect clearly Ilyich's thoughts just before his departure. I particularly remember what he then said about the militia. The third "Letter from Afar," *On Proletarian Militia* is devoted to this question. It was published only after Lenin's death in 1924. In it Ilyich presents his ideas on the proletarian state. Those who want thoroughly to understand Lenin's book, *State and Revolution*, must read this "Letter from Afar." The whole article treats the subject with extraordinary concreteness. Ilyich speaks of a new type of militia created by the general arming of citizens, consisting of all adults of both sexes. In addition to its military duties, this militia must secure the proper and speedy distribution of bread and other provisions, must act as sanitary inspectors, see that every family has bread, every child a bottle of good milk and that no adult in a rich family dare to take extra milk until all children are supplied, that the palaces

\* *Little Lenin Library*, No. 8. Also *Collected Works*, Vol. XX, Book I, pp. 27-63.

and rich homes do not remain unoccupied, but that they shelter the homeless and destitute.

"What other organisation except a universal people's militia with women participating on an equal footing with the men can effect these measures?" Ilyich wrote.

"Such measures *do not yet* constitute Socialism. They deal with distribution of articles of consumption, not with the reorganisation of production. . . . Theoretical classification doesn't matter now. It would indeed be a grave error if we tried now to fit the complex, urgent, rapidly unfolding practical tasks of the revolution into the Procrustean bed of a narrowly conceived 'theory,' instead of regarding theory first of all and above all as a *guide to action*."<sup>\*</sup> The proletarian militia should actually educate the masses to take part in all state affairs. "Such a militia would draw the youngsters into political life, training them not only by word, but by deed and work."<sup>†</sup> "Our immediate problem is organisation, not in the sense of effecting ordinary organisation by ordinary methods, but in the sense of drawing large masses of the oppressed classes in unheard of numbers into the organisation, and of embodying in this organisation military, state and national economic problems."<sup>‡</sup> Re-reading this letter after a lapse of many years, I can picture him as if he were before me now: his extraordinary sober-mindedness, his clear appreciation of the necessity of an irreconcilable armed struggle, and of the fact that no concessions or vacillation could be permitted at that moment; and on the other hand, his close attention to the mass movement, to the organisation of the broad masses in a new way, to their concrete needs, and to the immediate improvement of their conditions. Ilyich spoke of all these matters in the winter of 1916-17, and especially on the eve of the February revolution.

The negotiations dragged on. The Provisional government evidently did not want to allow the internationalists to enter Russia; news came from Russia of vacillation among the comrades. All this made it imperative to hasten our de-

\* *Little Lenin Library*, No. 8, p. 32.

† *Ibid.*, p. 31.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

parture. Ilyich sent a telegram to Ganetsky (who received it only on March 25th) in which he said: "We do not understand the delay. The Mensheviks want the sanction of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. Send someone immediately to Finland or Petrograd to come to terms with Chikheidze. Opinion of Belenin desirable." By Belenin was meant the Bureau of the Central Committee. When Kollontai arrived in Russia on March 18th she related how matters stood with Ilyich's coming; letters were received from Ganetsky. The Bureau of the Central Committee sent a message through Ganetsky saying, "Ulyanov must come immediately." Ganetsky re-telegraphed this message to Lenin. Vladimir Ilyich insisted that negotiations be opened through Fritz Platten, the Swiss Socialist-internationalist. Platten concluded a precise written agreement with the German ambassador in Switzerland. The main points of this agreement were: 1. All the emigrants regardless of their opinions on the war to be allowed to go; 2. No one to be allowed to enter the railway car in which the emigrants were travelling without Platten's permission. No inspection of passports or baggage; 3. The travellers undertake to agitate in Russia for the exchange of a number of Austro-German prisoners interned in Russia equal to the number of emigrants allowed to travel by this agreement. Ilyich energetically began to prepare for the journey, and wrote letters to Berne, Geneva and a number of comrades. The *Vperyod*-ists with whom Ilyich was negotiating refused to go. Kari and Kasparov, two close comrades, had to remain, they were very sick and dying in Davos. Ilyich wrote them a farewell greeting.

Ilyich wrote an article for the Zurich paper *Volksrecht*, entitled "The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party in the Russian Revolution,"\* and also a "Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers," which ended with the words "Long live the proletarian revolution that is *beginning* in Europe!"† Ilyich also addressed a letter to "Comrades Languishing in Captivity," Russian prisoners of war, in which he told them about the revolution and of the coming struggle.

\* Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XX, Book I, pp. 77-81.

† *Ibid*, pp 82-88. Also *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, pp. 13-20.

We had to write to them. While in Berne, we had started a rather considerable correspondence with Russian prisoners of war languishing in German camps. Of course, we could not help them much as far as material comforts were concerned, but we helped all we could by writing letters to them and sending them literature. A number of close connections were made, and after our departure from Berne the Safarovs continued this work. We sent these prisoners of war illegal literature, Kollontai's pamphlet on war which had a very good effect, and a number of leaflets. . . .

When the letter came from Berne informing us that Platten's negotiations had come to a successful conclusion and that only the protocol had to be signed, and we could move on to Russia, Ilyich jumped up and said: "We will take the first train." The train was due to leave within two hours. We had just these two hours to liquidate our entire "household," settle accounts with the landlady, return the books to the library, pack up and so on, "Go yourself, I will leave to-morrow," I said. But Ilyich insisted, "No, we will go together." In the two hours everything was done: books packed, letters destroyed, the necessary clothing and things chosen, and all affairs settled, and we caught the first train to Berne. We need not have hurried, however, for it was Easter and for that reason the train was late in starting.

The comrades going to Russia met in the Berne People's House; the Zinovievs, Usyevich, Inessa, Armand, the Safarovs, Olga Ravich, Abramovich from Chaux-de-Fonds, Grebelskaya, Haritonov, Linde, Rosenbloom, Boytsov, Mikha Tskhakay, the Marienhoffs, Sokolnikov, Radek under the guise of a Russian, and others. Altogether, thirty people travelled, without counting curly-headed Robert, the four-year-old son of a member of the Bund.

Fritz Platten accompanied us.

The defencists raised a hullabaloo about the Bolsheviks travelling through Germany. Of course, in giving us permission to travel, the German government was under the impression that revolution was a terrible disaster for a country and thought that by allowing emigre-internationalists to pass through to their native country they would help to spread this "disaster" in Russia. The Bolsheviks were very little

concerned with what the bourgeois German government thought. They considered it their duty to spread revolutionary propaganda in Russia and set as the aim of their activities the achievement of the victorious proletarian revolution. They knew that the defencists would throw mud at them, but they knew also that the masses would finally follow their lead. On March 27th the Bolsheviks alone risked the route through Germany, but a month later more than two hundred emigrants, including Martov and other Mensheviks, followed the same route.

In boarding the train, no questions were asked about the baggage and passports. Ilyich kept entirely to himself, his thoughts were in Russia. En route, the conversation was mainly trivial, Robert's cheerful voice could be heard through the whole car. He particularly liked Sokolnikov and did not want to talk to the women. The Germans tried to show us that they had plenty of everything, the cook prepared exceptionally big meals, to which our emigrant fraternity were not much accustomed. Through the car window we noticed surprising absence of adult men; some women, boys and girls in their teens and children could be seen at the stations, on the fields and city streets. I was often reminded of this picture during the first days in Pétrograd where I was surprised that the street cars were so crowded with soldiers.

On arrival in Berlin our train was shunted on to a siding. Near Berlin several German Social-Democrats entered a special compartment. No one of our people spoke to them, except Robert, who looked into their compartment and asked in French "What does the conductor do?" I do not know whether the Germans answered Robert, but I do know that they were not able to put the questions they wanted to put to the Bolsheviks. On March 31st we arrived in Sweden. At Stockholm we were met by the Swedish Social-Democratic deputies, Lindhagen, Carlson, Strom, Ture Nerman and others. A red flag was hung in the waiting-room and a meeting was held. I remember little of Stockholm; all our thoughts were in Russia. The Russian Provisional Government did not permit Fritz Platten and Radek to enter Russia but did not dare to stop the Bolsheviks. From Sweden we crossed to Finland in small Finnish sledges. Everything was

already familiar and dear to us—the wretched third-class cars, the Russian soldiers. It was terribly good. It was not long before Robert was in the arms of an elderly soldier, clasping his neck with his small arms, chattering to him in French and eating Easter cheese with which the soldier fed him. Our people were huddled against the windows. The station platforms we passed were crowded with soldiers. Usyevich leaned out of the window and shouted: "Long live the world revolution!" The soldiers looked at him puzzled. A pale-faced lieutenant passed us a few times, and when Ilyich and I went into a nearby empty car, he sat down beside Ilyich and spoke to him. The lieutenant was a defenceist, and they started an argument. Ilyich put his point of view—he, too, was dreadfully pale. Soldiers began squeezing into the car until there was no room to move. The soldiers stood on the benches so as the better to see and hear the one who was speaking so convincingly against the robber-war. And as the minutes passed they became more attentive and their faces became more tense.

Maria Ilyinichna, Shlyapnikov, Stahl and other comrades and women workers met us at Byelo-Ostrov. Stahl urged me to say a few words of greeting to the women workers, but all words had left me, I could say nothing. Ilyich asked the comrades who sat with us if we would be arrested on our arrival: they smiled. Soon we arrived in Petrograd.

The Petrograd masses, workers, soldiers and sailors came to meet their leader. Among the many close comrades there, was Churgurin—a student who had been at the Longjumeau school, his face wet with tears, wearing a wide red sash across his shoulder. There was a sea of people all around.

Those who have not lived through the revolution cannot imagine its grand, solemn beauty. Red banners, a guard of honour of Kronstadt sailors, searchlights from the Fortress of Peter and Paul illuminating the road from the Finland station to the Kshesinskaya Palace,\* armoured cars, a chain of working men and women guarding the road.

\* The former residence of the Tsar's mistress, the ballet dancer, Kshesinskaya. The mansion became the headquarters of the Bolshevik Party.—Ed.

Chkheidze and Skobelev met us at the Finland station as the official representatives of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The comrades led Ilyich to the tsar's rest-room where Chkheidze and Skobelev were. When Ilyich came out on to the platform a captain came to him and, standing at attention, reported something. Ilyich, a little taken aback with surprise, saluted. Ilyich and all our emigrant fraternity were led past a guard of honour which was on the platform. Ilyich stood on an armoured car, the rest were seated in automobiles and thus we drove to the Kshesinsky Palace. "Long live the Socialist world revolution!" Ilyich called out to the huge crowd of many thousands surrounding us.

Ilyich sensed the beginning of this revolution in every fibre of his body.

We arrived at the Kshesinsky Palace where the Central Committee and the Petrograd Committee of the Party then had their headquarters. The Petrograd comrades had arranged a comradely tea and wanted to organise speeches of welcome, but Ilyich turned the conversation to what interested him most, the tactics that had to be pursued. A huge crowd of workers and soldiers surrounded the house. Ilyich had to go out on the balcony and make a speech. The impressions of the meeting, of the upheaval of revolutionary elements put everything else into the shade.

We then went home to our people, to Anna Ilyinishna and Mark Timofeyevich. They lived in Shirokaya Street, on the Petrograd side, and Maria Ilyinishna lived with them. We were given a separate room. In honour of our arrival, Gora, Anna Ilyinishna's foster son, hung over our beds the slogan, "Workers of the World Unite." I hardly spoke to Ilyich that night—there were really no words to express the experience, everything was understood without words.

Times were such that not a minute could be wasted. Ilyich had not yet got up when a comrade came for him. He went with Zinoviev to the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet to report on the journey through Germany. From there he went to a conference of Bolsheviks—of the members of the All-Russian Conference of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies which was in session somewhere on

an upper floor of the Taurida Palace. In ten theses Lenin expressed his opinion on what had to be done. In these theses\* he gave his appraisal of the situation, clearly and definitely laid down the aims for which it was necessary to strive, and the road that must be followed to reach them. For the first few minutes our people were taken aback. It seemed to many that Lenin presented the question too bluntly, that it was still early to speak of Socialist revolution.

A meeting of Mensheviks was in progress on the floor below. A comrade came from there and insisted that Ilyich present the same report at a joint meeting of Menshevik and Bolshevik delegates. At the Bolshevik meeting it was decided that Ilyich repeat the report at a general meeting of all Social-Democrats. Ilyich did so. The joint meeting took place downstairs in the large hall of the Taurida Palace. I remember the first thing that caught my eye was that Goldenberg (Meshkovsky) was in the Presidium. In the 1905 revolution he was a strong Bolshevik, one of the very closest comrades in the struggle. Now he followed Plekhanov and had become a defencist. Lenin spoke for about two hours. Goldenberg was his opponent. He criticized Lenin very sharply and said that Lenin had raised the banner of civil war in the revolutionary democratic midst. How far we had drifted apart was apparent. I still remember Kollontai's fervent speech in defence of Lenin's theses.

In his newspaper *Edinstvo* (*Unity*), Plekhanov described Lenin's theses as "delirium."

Three days later, on April 7th, Lenin's theses were printed in *Pravda*. On the following day there was an article by Kamenev in *Pravda* entitled "Our Disagreements," in which he dissociated himself from Lenin's thesis and stated that they were the expression of Lenin's private opinion, that they were not advocated either by *Pravda* or by the Bureau of the Central Committee. The Bolshevik delegates at the meeting at which the theses were presented did not accept them, but

*The April Theses. See The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution. Selected Works, Vol. VI, pp. 21-30, and notes. Little Lenin Library, No. 10, The April Conference.*



accepted those of the Bureau of the Central Committee. Kamenev declared that *Pravda* maintained its old positions.

A struggle inside the Bolshevik organisation began, but it did not last long. In a week a general city conference of the Bolsheviks of Petrograd was held at which Ilyich's point of view triumphed. The conference continued eight days (April 14th-22nd), during which time a number of important events took place which proved how much in the right Lenin was.

On April 7th—the day Lenin's theses appeared in print—the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet voted for the issue of a "Liberty Loan."

The bourgeois and defencist press started a furious campaign against Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Kamenev's statement was ignored. Everybody knew that Lenin's point of view would prevail in the ranks of the Bolshevik organisation. The campaign against Lenin served to popularise his theses. Lenin called the war an imperialist war of plunder and all saw that he was in earnest about peace. This roused the sailors and soldiers, it roused those for whom the war was a question of life or death. On April 10th Lenin addressed the men of the Izmailovsky regiment; on the 15th the *Soldatskaya Pravda* (*Soldiers' Truth*) came out, and on the 16th the Petrograd soldiers and sailors organised a demonstration to protest against the campaign against Lenin and the Bolsheviks.

On April 18th\* (May 1st) grand May Day demonstrations took place throughout Russia such as had never been seen before.

On April 18th, Milyukov, Minister of Foreign Affairs, issued a statement in the name of the Provisional Government, to the effect that it would continue the war to a victorious conclusion and that it would remain loyal to all obligations to the Allies. What did the Bolsheviks do? They exposed what these obligations were in their press—they pointed out that the Provisional Government had pledged itself to carry out the obligations that were entered into by the government of Nicholas II and the whole tsarist gang.

\* The dates given in the text are according to the Russian old style calendar. For instance, the Bolshevik Revolution took place on October 25th, Old Style, which is November 7th, New Style.

They pointed out that they were obligations to the bourgeoisie.

When this became clear to the masses, they came out on the streets. On April 21st they organised a demonstration on the Nevsky. The supporters of the Provisional Government also organised a demonstration on the Nevsky.

These events united the Bolsheviks. The Bolshevik organisation in Petrograd passed a resolution in keeping with Lenin's views.

On April 21st and 22nd the Central Committee passed a resolution which clearly pointed out the need for exposing the Provisional Government, condemned the conciliatory tactics of the Petrograd Soviet, called for a re-election of workers' and soldiers' deputies and for the strengthening of the Soviets, appealed for broad explanatory propaganda and at the same time pointed out that attempts to overthrow the Provisional Government immediately would be premature.

The All-Russian Conference opened on April 24th, three weeks after Lenin's theses had gained publicity and the Bolsheviks had achieved unity.

After our arrival in Petrograd, I saw little of Ilyich. He was working at the Central Committee, and in *Pravda*, and attending meetings. I worked at the Secretariat of the Central Committee in the Kshesinsky Palace, but the work could not be compared with the Secretariat work abroad, or with that of 1905-07 when I had to carry on rather important work independently under Ilyich's directions. Stassova was the secretary; she was assisted by technical workers. I talked to the workers who came there. Still, I knew little of the local work. The Central Committee members came there frequently, Sverdlov most often of all. No special duties were assigned to me and the absence of definite work bored me. I greedily absorbed the life around me. The streets at that time presented an interesting sight; everywhere groups gathered, heatedly discussing the political situation and all the events that occurred. I used to mingle with the crowd and listen. Once I walked three hours from Shirokaya Street to the Kshesinsky Palace, so interesting were these meetings. There was a courtyard opposite our house from which excited arguments could be heard when we opened the

window at night. A soldier always sat there with someone—the cook, the maids from the neighbouring houses, or some youth. At one o'clock in the morning disjointed words could be heard such as: Bolsheviks, Mensheviks—At three o'clock: Milyukov, Bolsheviks—At five o'clock the same; politics and meetings. The white nights of Petrograd are now always associated in my mind with these nightly gatherings.

I had to meet many people at the Secretariat of the Central Committee; the Petrograd Committee, the military organisation and *Soldatskaya Pravda*, all were located at the Kshesinsky Palace. Sometimes I attended the meetings of the Petrograd Committee where I got to know the people more closely and followed the committee's work. The children and young workers also interested me very much. Children were taken up with the movement. Among them were supporters of different trends—Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and anarchists. At first there were about fifty thousand youths in the organisation, but at that time the movement was left pretty much to itself. I carried on some work among them. These young workers presented a striking contrast to the older groups of the middle-grade school. The latter often approached the Kshesinsky Palace in a crowd, hurling abuse at the Bolsheviks. It was apparent that they were put up to it by someone.

Soon after our arrival—I do not remember the exact date—I attended a teachers' congress. There was a huge crowd: the teachers were completely under the influence of the Socialist-Revolutionaries. Well-known defenceists spoke there on the morning of the day that I was there, but before my arrival Alexinsky addressed the congress. There were fifteen to twenty Social-Democrats among the teachers, including Bolsheviks and Menshevik-internationalists; they met separately in a small room where they exchanged opinions as to the kind of school they ought to fight for. Many of those present at that meeting later worked in the district Dumas.\* The mass of the teachers were intoxicated with chauvinism.

., \* Municipal Councils.—Ed

I heard both the speeches Ilyich delivered on April 4th and his speech at the Petrograd Conference.

On April 18th (May 1st) Ilyich took part in the May Day demonstration and spoke both on the Okhta and on the Field of Mars. I did not hear him as I was so ill that day I could not get up. When Ilyich returned I was surprised by his excited appearance. When we lived abroad we generally paraded on May Day, but May Day by police permission is one thing, and the May Day of the revolutionary masses, the masses who had triumphed over tsarism, was different.

On April 21st I had to meet Ilyich at Danskoys. I had the address, Staro-Nevsky 3, and I walked the whole length of the Nevsky. A large workers' demonstration came from the Nevsky Gate. Workers who were crowding on the side-walk greeted the demonstration. "Let us go," called one young working woman to another. "Let us go, we will march all night!" Another crowd wearing hats and bowlers moved towards the workers' demonstration; they were greeted by other people with the same headgear on the sidewalk. The workers predominated nearer the Nevsky Gate, but nearer to Morskaya Street and Poitseysky Bridge the bowlers and hats were more numerous. The story was passing from mouth to mouth among the crowd of how Lenin had bribed the workers with German gold and now all were following him. "We must beat Lenin!" shouted a stylishly dressed girl. "Kill all these scoundrels," someone in a bowler roared. Class against Class! The working class stood for Lenin.

From April 24th to the 29th the All-Russian Conference, known as the April Conference, which finally united the Bolsheviks, took place. A hundred and fifty-one delegates attended. A new Central Committee was elected. The questions that were discussed were of extraordinary importance, viz.—the political situation, the war, preparation for organising the Third International, the national question, the agrarian question, and the Party programme.

I remember particularly Ilyich's speech on the political situation.

The most outstanding thing about this speech was the way it clearly revealed Ilyich's attitude to the masses, how closely he observed how the masses lived, and what they

thought: "There is no doubt whatever that, as a class, the proletariat and semi-proletariat have no material interest in the war. They are under the influence of tradition and deception. They still lack political experience. Hence our task is one of prolonged explanation. We do not make the slightest concession on matters of principle but we cannot approach them as we approached the social chauvinists. These elements of the population have never been Socialists, they have not the slightest inkling of Socialism and are just awakening to political life. But their class-consciousness is growing and broadening with extraordinary rapidity. We must know how to adopt our explanations to them and that is a most difficult thing, particularly for a party that but yesterday was underground" \*

"Many of us, myself included," said Ilyich in this speech, "have had occasion to address the people, particularly the soldiers, and it seems to me that even when everything is explained to them from the point of view of class interests, there is still one thing in our position that they cannot fully grasp, namely, in what way we intend to finish the war, in what way we think it possible to bring the war to an end. The masses are in a maze of misapprehension, there is an absolute lack of understanding as to our stand, that is why we must be particularly clear in this case." †

".....When we address the masses, we must give them concrete answers to all questions." ‡

"We must be able to carry on the work of explanation," said Ilyich, "not only among the proletariat, but also among wide sections of the petty bourgeoisie."

Speaking of control, Vladimir Ilyich said: "To control, one must have power. If the broad masses of the petty-bourgeois *bloc* do not understand this, we must have the patience to explain it to them, but under no circumstances must we tell them an untruth." § Ilyich did not resort to demagoguery, and this was felt by the soldiers and peasants who spoke to him. But confidence cannot be won at once. Even in such a time of excitement, Ilyich retained his usual

\* Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. VI., p. 95. *Collected Works*, Vol. XX, Book I, p. 278. † *Ibid.*, p. 275. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 279. § *Ibid.*, p. 274.

sobriety of thought : "So far we are in the minority ; the masses do not trust us yet. We can wait; they will side with us when the government reveals its true nature." \* Ilyich had many talks with soldiers and peasants and even at that time saw no little evidence of trust, but he had no illusions: "The proletarian party would be guilty of the most grievous error if it shaped its policy on the basis of subjective desires where organisation is required. We cannot assert that the majority is with us; in this case our motto should be: caution, caution, caution. To base our proletarian policy on over-confidence means to condemn it to failure." †

In concluding his speech on the political situation Ilyich said : "The Russian Revolution has created the Soviets. No bourgeois country in the world has or can have such state institutions. No Socialist revolution can function with any other state power. The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies must seize power not for the purpose of building an ordinary, bourgeois republic, nor for the purpose of introducing Socialism immediately. The latter could not be accomplished. What, then, is the purpose ? They must seize power in order to take the first concrete steps towards introducing Socialism, steps that can and should be taken. In this case fear is the greatest enemy. The masses should be convinced that these steps must be taken immediately, that otherwise the power of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies would be devoid of meaning, and would offer nothing to the people." ‡

And further, Ilyich spoke of the immediate tasks before the Soviets. "Private ownership of land must be abolished. This is our first task, because the majority of the people are for it. To accomplish this we need the Soviets. This measure cannot be carried out by means of the old government bureaucracy."§ And he closed by quoting an example to illustrate what the struggle for power locally means. "I shall conclude by referring to a speech that made a very strong impression on me. A certain coal-miner delivered a remarkable speech in which without using a single bookish phrase he told how they had made the revolution. Those

\* *Ibid.*, p. 275. † *Ibid.*, p. 279. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 283 § *Ibid.*, p. 284.

miners were not concerned with the question as to whether or not they should have a president. When they seized the mine, the question that interested him was how to keep the cables intact so that production might not be interrupted. Then came the question of bread, which they lacked. Here too they agreed how it was to be obtained. Now this is a real programme of the revolution, not derived from books. This is a real seizure of power locally.”\*

Zinaida Pavlovna Krzhizhanovskaya once recalled to mind what I told her about the miner in this speech and she said : “Now these miners need engineers mostly. Vladimir Ilyich thinks it would be wonderful if Gleb would go down there.”

We met many friends at the Conference. Among others I remember meeting Prisyagin, a student at the Longjumeau school. Listening to Ilyich’s speech his eyes glistened. Prisyagin is not alive now, he was killed in the Urals by the Whites in 1918.

At the beginning of May 1917, Ilyich drafted amendments to the Party programme. The imperialist war and the revolution had caused fundamental changes in social life and this required new evaluations and a new approach—the old programme had become obsolete.

The new minimum programme that Ilyich drew up breathed the striving to improve, to raise the standard of living of the masses, a striving to give the masses scope for displaying their initiative.

My work at the secretariat bored me more and more, I wanted to get into real mass work, I also wanted to see Ilyich more often, for I became increasingly anxious about him. The campaign against him was growing in fury. Going down the Petersburg Side, one could hear some housewife jeering : “What should be done with this Lenin who came from Germany ? Should he be drowned in a well or what?” Of course, the source of these rumours about bribery and treachery was well known, but it was not pleasant to hear. To hear such talk from the bourgeoisie was one thing, but to hear it from the masses was quite another thing. I wrote an article about Lenin for *Soldatskaya Pravda* under the title

\* *Ibid.* Selected Works, Vol. VI., p. 102.

"A Page from the History of the Party." Ilyich made some corrections in the manuscript, and it was published in the No. 21 issue, on May 13th, 1917.

Vladimir Ilyich usually returned home tired, and I could not bring myself to question him about affairs. But we both wanted to talk things over, as we formerly had on our walks. And sometimes, though rarely, we took walks along the quieter streets on the Petrograd side.

I remember Ilyich's speech at the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies which took place in the Military School on the First Line\* on Vasilevsky Island. We passed through a long corridor; the classrooms had been turned into dormitories for the delegates. The hall was crowded. The Bolsheviks sat in a small group at the back of the hall. Although only the Bolsheviks applauded Lenin, there was no doubt about the strong impression his speech created. I do not know how true the story is, but later it was said that as a result of his speech, Kerensky lay unconscious for three hours.

The district Duma elections took place in June. I went to Vasilevsky Island to see what progress was being made in the election campaign. The streets were filled with workers, those from the tube factory predominating. There were many working women from the Lafern factory who had voted for the Socialist-Revolutionaries. Everywhere, groups were engaged in heated argument, but it was not the candidates or the leaders who were being discussed, but the parties, what the various parties were doing, what they stood for. I recalled the municipal elections in Paris; when we were there we were amazed at the absence of political issues and the volume of personal issues introduced. Here the situation was completely reversed. The development of the masses since 1905-07 was very apparent. It was evident that all read the newspapers of the different political trends. One group was discussing the possibility of Bonapartism. A small, spy-like figure, darting about in the crowd seemed very much out of place in this group of workers who had developed so much in the last few years. The revolutionary spirit of the masses was growing.

\* One of the main streets of Petrograd.—*Ed.*



The Bolsheviks had decided to hold a demonstration on June 10th. The Congress prohibited this demonstration and passed a decision to the effect that no demonstrations whatever were to be held for three days. Ilyich then insisted that the demonstration, called by the Petrograd Committee, be abandoned. He argued that since we recognised the power of the Soviets, we were obliged to submit to the decisions of the Congress, otherwise we would be playing into the hands of the enemies. But, yielding to the mood of the masses, the Congress of Soviets itself arranged for a demonstration to be held on June 18th. But the Congress got more than it expected. Nearly four hundred thousand workers and soldiers took part in that demonstration. Ninety per cent. of the banners and placards bore the slogans of the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks: "All power to the Soviets!" "Down with the ten capitalist ministers!" There were only three placards supporting the Provisional government—one of the Bund, the other of the Plekhanov group, *Edinstvo* (Unity), and the third of a Cossack regiment. Ilyich characterised June 18th as one of the decisive days. "The demonstration of July 1st (June 18th)," he wrote, "first became a demonstration of the strength and the policy of the revolutionary proletariat which is giving direction to the revolution, and is showing the way out of the blind alley. Therein lies the colossal historical significance of the Sunday demonstration, and therein does it differ in principle from the demonstrations which took place on the day of the funeral of the victims of the revolution, or from those held on May 1st. Then it was a universal tribute to the first victory of the revolution, and to its heroes, a glance backward cast by the people over the first lap of the road to freedom and passed by them most quickly and most successfully. The first of May was a holiday of good wishes and hopes bound up with the history of the labour movement of the world, with its ideal of peace and Socialism.

"Neither of the demonstrations aimed at pointing out the direction of the further advance of the revolution. Neither could point out that direction. Neither the first nor the second demonstration had placed before the masses, and in the name of the masses, any concrete and definite questions

of the hour, questions as to whether and how the revolution must proceed.

"In this sense the first of July was the first political demonstration of action; it was an exposition of issues not in a book nor in a newspaper, but in the street; not through leaders, but through the masses. It showed how the various classes act, wish to act, and should act, to further the revolution. The bourgeoisie had hidden itself."<sup>2</sup>

The elections to the district Dumas were over. I was elected to the Vyborg district council. The only candidates to be elected to this council were Bolsheviks and a few Menshevik-Internationalists. The latter, however, did no work on the council. The only ones to work were the Bolsheviks: L. M. Michaelov, Kuchmenka, Ohugurin, another comrade and I. At first our council met in the same building as the district Party Committee of which Zhenya Egorova was the secretary, and where Comrade Latsis also worked. Very close contact was maintained between our council and the Party organisation. I learned a great deal from the work in the Vyborg district. It was a good school for Party and Soviet work. During the many years that I had lived abroad as a political exile, I never dared to make a speech even at a small meeting, and until that time I had never written a single line in *Pravda*. I needed such a school very much.

There was a staunch group of active Bolsheviks in the Vyborg district who enjoyed the confidence of the masses of the workers. Soon after I began work on the council, I took over the affairs of the Vyborg district branch of the Committee for the Relief of Soldiers' Wives, of which Nina Alexandrovna Gerd, the wife of Struve, had been in charge. She was an old friend, we were fellow students at the gymnasium and had taught together at Sunday school.† In the early years of the development of the workers' movement she had been a Social-Democrat. Now we each held entirely different points of view. She gave the work over to me with the remark: "The soldiers' wives do not trust us; they are displeased with whatever we do; they have faith

\* Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XX—"The Revolution of 1917"—Book II, p. 268.

† Workers' educational classes.—*Ibid.*

only in the Bolsheviks. Well, you take the work over; perhaps you will be able to do it better than we did." We were not afraid to undertake the work. We were confident that together with the workers, on whose co-operation we could depend, we could develop the work on a wide scale.

The masses of the workers not only took a very active part in politics, but also in educational work. Very soon we set up an Education Council on which there were representatives from all the works and factories of the Vyborg district. I remember that among them were the workers, Puryshov, Kayurov, Yurkin, Gordienko; we met every week and discussed practical measures. When the question came up of the need for introducing general literacy, the workers in all the factories quickly registered all the illiterates. The employers were asked to provide rooms in the factory for classes for instructing the illiterate. When one of them refused, the women workers raised a tremendous outcry and exposed the fact that one of the factory rooms was occupied by shock troops (i.e. soldiers selected from particularly chauvinistic battalions). Finally, the employer had to rent premises outside of the factory for the school. A committee of workers was set up to supervise the attendance of the classes and the work of the teachers. Near the premises of the district council a machine-gun regiment was stationed. At first this regiment was considered very reliable but its "reliability" quickly disappeared. As soon as it was stationed on the Vyborg Side, agitation began to be carried on among the soldiers. The first to carry on Bolshevik agitation among the soldiers were the sellers of sunflower seeds, cider, etc.; many were soldiers' wives. The women workers of the Vyborg district did not resemble those I knew in the nineties, or even in the 1905 revolution. They were well dressed, active at meetings and politically intelligent. One woman worker said to me: "My husband is at the front. We lived well together, but I do not know how it will be when he returns. I am for the Bolsheviks now and I will go with them, but I don't know about him there at the front. . . . Does he understand, does he realise that we must follow the Bolsheviks. Often I think at night—perhaps he does not understand yet. Only I don't know whether I shall see him again,

perhaps he will be killed. Yes, and I spit blood, I am going to the hospital." The thin face of this woman worker with the hectic flush on her cheeks, her anxiety about possible difference of opinion with her husband made an indelible impression on my mind. But it was not the working women, but the working men who were most advanced in educational work at that time. The men looked into everything. Comrade Gordienko, for example, was very much occupied with kindergarten work and Comrade Kuklin closely followed the work of the youth.

I also took up work among the youth. A youth league was formed called "Light and Knowledge," and had a programme. The league consisted of Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Anarchists and adherents of no party. The programme was most naive and primitive, but the arguments that arose around it were very interesting. For instance, one of the items was that all members must learn to sew. Then one young fellow, a Bolshevik, asked: "Why should everyone learn to sew? Girls, of course, must be able to sew, otherwise, later on, they will not be able to sew buttons on their husbands' trousers, but why should all learn? These words raised a storm of indignation. Not only the girls but everybody expressed indignation and jumped up from their seats. "The wife must sew buttons on trousers? What do you mean? Do you want to uphold the old slavery of women? The wife is her husband's comrade, not his servant!" The lad who proposed that only women learn to sew had to surrender. I remember a conversation with another lad, Murashev by name, an ardent supporter of the Bolsheviks. I asked him: "Why don't you join the Bolshevik Party?" "You see," he answered, "several of us young people joined the Party. But why did we join? Do you think because we understood that the Bolsheviks were right? Not for that reason, but because the Bolsheviks distributed revolvers! That's no good. When one joins a Party one must know what it stands for. I returned my card until I should fully understand." It must be said that only the revolutionary-minded young men and women joined the "Light and Knowledge" League; they would not tolerate anyone in their midst who expressed conservative views. The members were very

active, spoke at meetings at their factories, and at their own meetings. But they were very trustful. This trustfulness had to be fought.

I had quite a lot of work to do among the women. I had already got over my former shyness and spoke wherever it was necessary.

I plunged right into the work. I wanted to draw the masses into social work, to do the utmost to make it possible to establish that "people's militia" of which Lenin had spoken.

After I started work in the Vyborg district, I saw still less of Ilyich, but times were becoming acute, the struggle was blazing forth. June 18th was remarkable, not only for the demonstration of four hundred thousand workers and soldiers that took place under Bolshevik slogans; on that day the Provisional government, after vacillating for months, submitted to the pressure of the Allies and started the offensive at the front. The Bolsheviks had already started to agitate in the press and at meetings. The Provisional government felt that the ground was slipping from under its feet. On June 28th the news of the first defeats of the Russian army at the front was received; this excited the soldiers very much.

At the end of June Ilyich, accompanied by Maria Ilyinishna, went to visit Bonch-Bruевич, who lived in the village of Neyvola, near Mustamyaki (not far from Petrograd), to take a few days' rest. While they were away the following incident occurred in Petrograd. The machine-gun regiment stationed on the Vyborg Side decided to start an armed uprising. Two days before this our education committee had arranged to meet the education committee of the regiment on Monday to discuss certain educational questions. Of course, no one came from the regiment. The whole regiment had gone. On my way to the Kshesinsky palace I saw the machine-gun soldiers on Samsonovskiy Avenue marching in good order. The following scene impressed itself on my memory: an old worker stepped off the side-walk, walked towards the marching soldiers and, bowing low, said loudly: "Now, brothers, do stand up for the working people." Among those who were present at the headquarters of the Central Committee in the Kshesinsky palace were Comrades

Stalin and Lashevich. The machine-gun regiment marched to the palace. When they got there they halted near the balcony, saluted and then marched on. Later, two more regiments marched to the headquarters of the Central Committee, then a workers' demonstration came. In the evening a comrade was sent to Mustamyaki for Ilyich. The Central Committee had issued the slogan to turn the demonstration into a peaceful one, but the machine-gun regiment was already erecting barricades. I can recall Comrade Lashevich, who led the work in this regiment, lying for a long time on a couch in a room at the Vyborg council, looking at the ceiling, reluctant to go to the machine-gunners to stop them. It was hard for him to go, but such was the decision of the Central Committee. The works and factories were on strike. Sailors had arrived from Kronstadt. A huge demonstration of armed workers and soldiers was marching to the Taurida Palace. Ilyich spoke from the balcony of the Kshesinsky palace. The Central Committee issued a manifesto for a cessation of the demonstration. The Provisional Government called out the Junkers\* and Cossacks, who opened fire on the demonstrators in Sadovaya Street. It was arranged that Ilyich pass that night at the Sulimovs on the Petersburg Side, but it was safest for him to hide on the Vyborg Side. It was decided that he should live at the house of Kayurov, a worker. I went to Sulimovs to inform Ilyich of the arrangement and we both went to the Vyborg Side. We passed the Moscow Regiment marching along a boulevard, Kayurov was sitting in the boulevard, and seeing us, he walked ahead and Ilyich followed him. I turned back. The Junkers completely wrecked the editorial office of *Pravda*. During the day a meeting of the Petrograd Committee was held in the watchman's room at the Reno factory, at which Ilyich was present. The question of a general strike was discussed and it was decided not to call the strike. From there Ilyich went to Comrade Fofanov's flat in Lesnoy district where he met several of the members of the Central Committee. That day the workers' movement was suppressed. Alexinsky, a former representative of the Petrograd workers in the Second Duma.

\* Students of the military school.--Ed.

a *Vperyod*-ist, who at one time had been a close associate in our work, and Pankratov, a member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party and an old Schlösselberg prisoner, issued a slanderous statement to the effect that they had authentic information that Lenin was a German spy. They believed that this slander would paralyse Lenin's influence. On July 6th, the Provisional Government issued an order for the arrest of Lenin, Zinoviev and Kamenev. The Kshesinsky palace was occupied by Government troops. Lenin left Kayurov's house to go to Alliluev's where Zinoviev was also in hiding, as Kayurov's son was an anarchist; the young men were playing around with bombs and the house was not very safe for hiding.

On the 7th, Maria Ilyinishna and I went to visit Ilyich at Alliluev's house. This was just the moment when Ilyich wavered. He argued that he ought to surrender to the authorities and appear in court. Maria Ilyinishna objected violently. "Gregory and I have decided to appear, go and tell Kamenev," Ilyich said to me. At that time Kamenev was staying near by at another flat. I hastily made ready to go. "Let us say good-bye," Vladimir Ilyich said, stopping me—"we may not see each other again," we embraced. I went to Kamenev and delivered Vladimir Ilyich's message. In the evening, Comrade Stalin and others urged Ilyich not to appear in Court and finally convinced him: by that they saved his life. That evening the military raided our flat in Shirokaya Street. A colonel and another military man in a grey coat with a white lining appeared. They searched only our room and took some notes and my documents from the table. They asked me if I knew where Ilyich was, and from this I concluded that he had not given himself up. In the morning I went to Comrade Smilga, who also lived in Shirokaya Street; Stalin and Molotov lived with him. I learned from them that Ilyich and Zinoviev had decided to hide.

Two days later, on the 9th, a horde of Junkers raided the house and ransacked the whole flat. Mark Timofeyevich Elizarov, the husband of Anna Ilyinishna, was in the house and they thought he was Ilyich. They questioned me about Ilyich. At that time the Elizarovs had a servant, Annushka, a girl who came from a remote village and knew nothing

about what was going on. She was very anxious to learn to read and write and at every spare moment she read her primer, but she was a poor scholar: "I am a village block-head," she sorrowfully exclaimed. I tried to help her learn to read and to understand something about the various parties, the war, etc. She had no idea who Lenin was. I had not been at home on the 8th, when, as our people told me, an automobile had driven up to the house and a hostile demonstration was made. Suddenly Annushka ran out and yelled: "Some sort of *olenins* have arrived." During the search, the Junkers began to question her and, pointing to Mark Timofeyevich, they asked his name. She did not know. They decided that she did not want to tell. They then searched the kitchen, even looking under her bed. Annushka indignantly remarked: "Look in the oven, someone may be sitting there." They took the three of us, Mark Timofeyevich, Annushka and me, to the General Staff Headquarters. There they put us at some distance from each other, an armed soldier at the side of each. After a while, some officers burst in in a rage, ready to throw themselves at us. But the colonel who had been in charge of the first search came in, looked at us and said: "These are not the people we want." Had Ilyich been there, they would have torn him to pieces. We were dismissed. Mark Timofeyevich insisted that they give us an automobile to go home in. The colonel promised and left, but of course we were not given an automobile. We hired a cab. The bridges were drawn up, so we did not reach home until morning. We knocked at the door a long time and were beginning to fear that something had happened to our people, but finally the door was opened.

Our place was searched a third time when I was away at the district council. I came home and found the entrance occupied by soldiers and the street full of people. I remained there a while and then went back to the district council without going in as, in any case, I could not have been of any assistance. When I reached the district council, it was already late, no one was there but the caretaker. Shortly after, Slutsky, a comrade who had recently arrived from America, arrived together with Volodarsky, Melnichansky



and others; Slutsky was later killed on the southern front. He had just been under arrest and urged me not to go home, but to send someone in the morning to find out what had happened. We went out to look for a place to spend the night, but we did not know the addresses of comrades. We wandered through the district a long time before we came upon Fofanova, a comrade who worked in the district, who put us up for the night. In the morning we found that none of our people had been arrested and that this time the search had not been as rough as the preceding ones.

Ilyich and Zinoviev were in hiding at the house of an old member of the underground Party organisation, Emelyanov, who worked at the Sestroretsk factory and lived at Rozliv, near Sestroretsk. Ilyich always retained a warm feeling towards Emelyanov and his family.

I spent all my time in the Vyborg district. During the July days I was struck with the difference between the spirit of the petty bourgeoisie and that of the workers. On the trams, in the streets, from all corners could be heard the mutterings of discontent, but across the wooden bridge on the Vyborg Side one came upon an entirely different world. There were many things to do. Through Comrade Zoft and others connected with Comrade Emelyanov, I received various messages from Ilyich. The reaction increased. On July 9th the joint meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies declared the Provisional Government to be "the government of salvation of the revolution"; on the same day the "salvation" began. On that day Kamenev was arrested; on July 12th the order was given for the introduction of capital punishment at the front; on July 15th, *Pravda* and *Okopnaya Pravda* (*Trench Truth*) were suppressed, and an order was issued prohibiting meetings at the front. Bolsheviks were arrested in Helsinki, and *Volna*, the Bolshevik newspaper there, was suppressed. On July 18th the Finnish Diet was dissolved, General Kornilov was appointed Commander-in-Chief, on July 22nd Trotsky and Lunacharsky were arrested.

Soon after the July days, Kerensky devised a scheme by which he thought army discipline would be raised; he decided

to march the machine-gun regiment which had started the demonstration in the July days, unarmed, into a public square and there degrade them. I saw the disarmed regiment march into the square. As they led their horses by the bridle so much hatred burned in their eyes, there was so much hatred expressed in their slow march, that it was clear that a more stupid method could not have been devised. And as a matter of fact, in October, the machine-gun regiment followed the Bolsheviks to a man, the machine-gunners guarding Ilyich at Smolny.

The Bolshevik Party was reduced to semi-legality ; but it grew in numbers and strength. By the time the 6th Congress of the Party was opened, on July 26th, the membership had reached one hundred and seventy-seven thousand, twice as large as it was three months previously at the All-Russian Bolshevik Conference. There could be no doubt of the growth of Bolshevik influence, particularly in the army. The 6th Party Congress helped still further to rally the forces of the Bolsheviks. The Congress issued a manifesto in which it called attention to the counter-revolutionary position taken by the Provisional Government. "The world revolution and the battle of classes are impending," the manifesto stated. "Our Party is entering this battle with its banner unfurled. It has firmly held this banner in its grasp. It has not dropped it before the violators and slanderers, before traitors to the revolution and flunkies of capital. It will hold the banner aloft in the struggle for Socialism, for the brotherhood of nations, for it knows that a new movement is rising and that the death hour of the old world is approaching."

On August 25th, Kornilov with his troops began to march on Petrograd. The Petrograd workers and the Vyborg workers were the first, of course, to rush to the defence of Petrograd. Our agitators were sent to encounter the first detachments of Kornilov's troops, the "wild division" as they were called. The Kornilov forces were quickly disintegrated, and no real fighting took place. General Krymov, the commander of the corps which was to attack Petrograd, shot himself. I recall the figures of one of our Vyborg workers, a young fellow who worked on our educational committee, running into the district Duma with a rifle still on his

shoulder. He had just returned from the front where he was among the first to go. Although when he entered his face was still flushed with the excitement of battle, he threw his rifle into a corner and began to talk heatedly about crayons, of which there was a shortage at the school, and about blackboards. Every day I had the opportunity to observe how closely the workers in the Vyborg district linked the revolutionary struggle with the struggle for mastering knowledge and culture.

It was no longer possible for Ilyich to continue living in the hut near Rozliv, where he was in hiding. The autumn came and Ilyich decided to cross over to Finland. He wished to work on his book *State and Revolution*, for which he had collected a considerable amount of material, and which he had already thought out and planned. In Finland it was also easier to follow the newspapers.

N. A. Emelyanov obtained a passport belonging to a Sestroretsk workman and Ilyich put on a wig and made up to resemble this workman. Dmitry Ilyich Leschenko, at whose house Lenin had often slept, went to Rozliv to photograph Ilyich for the passport (a photograph had to be affixed to the passport). Comrade Leschenko was an old Party comrade of 1905-1907, who had formerly been associate editor of our Bolshevik paper and who at the time was helping me in educational work in the Vyborg district. A Finnish comrade, Yalava, an engine-driver on the Finnish Railway, whom Comrades Shotman and Rakhya knew well, undertook to get Ilyich across, disguised as a fireman. The plan succeeded. All connections with Ilyich were also maintained through Comrade Yalava and on more than one occasion I went to Yalava, who lived in the Vyborg district, for letters from Ilyich. After Ilyich had settled in Helsingfors, he sent a letter written in invisible ink asking me to come; he sent his address and even drew a map with directions to his place so that I might not have to ask anyone how to reach it. But I scorched the edge of the map when I heated the letter over the lamp. The Emelyanovs obtained for me a passport belonging to an old Sestroretsk working woman, and I covered my head with a shawl and went to Rozliv to meet them. They accompanied me across the

border. All that was required of persons living in that locality was a permit to cross the border. An officer glanced at my permit. I had to walk five versts through a forest from the borders to Olilla, a small station, where I took a soldiers' train. Everything went off well, except for a delay caused by the lack of directions contained on that part of the map which I had burned. I wandered through the streets a long time until I found the street I wanted. Ilyich was very glad to see me. The effects of living in seclusion when it was so necessary for him to be in the midst of the preparations for battle were apparent. I stayed in Helsingfors for a couple of days and told him all the news. When I left, Ilyich escorted me to the last turn of the road, although he wanted very much to accompany me to the station. We arranged that I should come again.

Two weeks later I again visited Ilyich. I was delayed for some reason and decided not to go to the Emelyanovs but to go straight to Olilla by myself. When I reached the forest night began to fall—it was already mid-autumn—the moon rose. My feet began to sink in the sand. It seemed to me that I had lost the road; I hurried on. Finally I reached Olilla but I had to wait half an hour for the train. The train was filled with soldiers and sailors and was so crowded that I had to stand all the way. The soldiers openly spoke of an uprising; the only thing they talked about was politics. The scene in the car was like that at an extremely exciting meeting. None but soldiers and sailors were in the car. One civilian did come in at first, but after listening to the soldiers relating how they threw officers into the river, he got out as quickly as he could at the next station. No one paid any attention to me. When I told Ilyich what they talked about, his face became thoughtful and remained so no matter what he talked of. It was apparent that his mind was not on what he was saying, it was fixed on rebellion and how best to prepare for it.

On September 13th-14th Ilyich wrote the letter *Marxism and Insurrection\** to the Central Committee; at the end of September he left Helsingfors for Vyborg, so as to be nearer

\* *Selected Works*, Vol. VI., pp. 218-223.

to Petrograd. From Vyborg he wrote to Smilga in Helsingfors (Smilga was at that time the chairman of the regional committee of the army, navy and workers of Finland), that all attention must be devoted to the preparation of the Finnish army and navy for war to overthrow Kerensky. His mind was constantly engaged on the problem of how to reorganise the whole state apparatus, how the masses were to be reorganised, how the whole social "fabric" was to be rewoven—as he expressed it. He wrote about this in his article, *Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?*\* He wrote about it in his manifesto to the peasants and soldiers, in a letter he sent to the Petrograd City Conference to be read at a private meeting where concrete measures to be taken for the seizure of power were being discussed; he wrote about it to the members of the Central Committee, the Petrograd Committee, the Moscow Committee, and the Bolshevik members of the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets.

On October 7th Ilyich moved from Vyborg to Petrograd. It was decided to maintain strict secrecy concerning his whereabouts; not even to inform the Central Committee of his address. We housed him on the Vyborg Side in the flat of Marguerita Vasilyevna Fofanova, which was in a large house at the corner of Lesnoy Avenue, almost entirely inhabited by workers. The apartment was very suitable for the purpose, for most of the family had left in the summer and even the servants had not yet returned; and Marguerita Vasilyevna was an ardent Bolshevik. She carried out all Ilyich's errands. Three days later, on October 10th, Ilyich attended a meeting of the Central Committee at Suchanov's flat, where a resolution in favour of an armed insurrection was passed. Ten members of the Central Committee voted in favour of the resolution—Lenin, Sverdlov, Stalin, Dzerzhinsky, Trotsky, Uritsky, Kollontai, Bubnov, Sokolnikov and Lomov. Zinoviev and Kamenev voted against it.

On October 15th a meeting of the Petrograd organisation took place at the Smolny Institute (this fact alone was very significant); district delegates were present (eight from the Vyborg district). I remember Dzerzhinsky speaking in favour

\* *Selected Works*. Vol. VI, pp. 250-296

of an armed insurrection. Chudnovsky spoke against it. Chudnovsky's arm was bandaged, he had been wounded at the front. Excitedly, he pointed out that defeat was inevitable, that we must not hurry. "Nothing is easier than to die for the revolution, but we will jeopardise the revolution if we just allow ourselves to be shot." Chudnovsky actually did die for the revolution; he was killed during the civil war. He was not a phrase-monger, but his point of view was thoroughly wrong. I do not remember the other speeches. When the vote was taken the overwhelming majority was found to be in favour of immediate insurrection. All the Vyborg delegates voted for it.

Next day, the 16th, an enlarged meeting of the Central Committee was held in the premises of the Lesnoy sub-district Duma in Lesnoy Avenue, at which, in addition to the members of the Central Committee, there were present members of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Committee, the military organisation, the Petrograd Council of Trade Unions, members of the factory and works committees, and of the Petrograd District Committee of the railroad workers. At this meeting there were two factions, the majority which was in favour of immediate insurrection, and the minority, which was against it. Lenin's resolution was carried by an overwhelming majority, nineteen for, two against and four abstaining. The question was decided. At a private meeting of the Central Committee, a military revolutionary centre was elected. Very few came to see Lenin—I, Maria Ilyinishna and sometimes Comrade Rakhya. I recollect the following scene. Ilyich had sent Fofanova on some errand; it was arranged that he would not open the door for anyone and that he would not answer the bell. It was also arranged that I knock in a certain manner. Fofanova had a cousin who attended a military school. I came in the evening and saw this fellow on the staircase. He appeared embarrassed. He saw me and said: "Someone has stolen into Marguerita's apartment." "What do you mean, stolen in?" "Yes, I came, rang and a man's voice answered. Then I rang and rang and nobody answered." I told him a tale about Marguerita having gone to a meeting, and that I was sure he was mistaken about hearing the voice. I only

felt at ease when he left and boarded a tram. I then turned back and knocked in the manner agreed upon. When Ilyich opened the door, I began to scold him: The fellow might have called other people," I said. "I thought it was something urgent," Ilyich replied in excuse. I, too, was carrying Ilyich's messages most of the time. On October 24th he wrote to the Central Committee urging the necessity of taking power that day. He sent Marguerita with this message. But not waiting for her return, he put on a wig and went to the Smolny himself. Not a minute was to be lost. He met Marguerita on the way and told her he was going to Smolny and that she need not wait for him.

The Vyborg district was preparing for the insurrection. There were fifty women workers in the premises of the Vyborg Council during the entire night, a woman doctor was giving them instructions in first aid. In the rooms of the district committee the workers were being armed; group after group came to the committee and received rifles and ammunition. But in the Vyborg district there was no one to be suppressed—they arrested only a colonel and a few Junkers who had come into a workers' club to have some tea. In the evening Zhenya Egorova and I went to the Smolny on a truck to find out how things were going.

On October 25th (November 7th), 1917, the Provisional Government was overthrown. Political power passed to the Military Revolutionary Committee—the organ of the Petrograd Soviet which stood at the head of the Petrograd proletariat and garrison. On the same day, the Military Revolutionary Council transferred power to the Second All-Russian Congress of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. A workers' and peasants' government was formed, and a Council of People's Commissars was set up, the chairman of which was Lenin.